



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

KSH 880

~~Soc 708.1~~

Bound
AUG 10 1903

Harvard College Library

FROM

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL
OF ECONOMICS



The International Socialist Review

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST THOUGHT -:- -:- -:- -:-

VOLUME III.

JULY, 1902—JUNE, 1903.



CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1903

△
KSH 880

1039
19
~~Soc 7081~~

Quant. Jour. Econ.
CONTENTS

ANDREWS, E. F.— A True Philosophy of Capitalism 266	GARVER, W. L.— Tolstoi and Socialism..... 743
ANDERSON, ANDREW M.— Notes from Australla..... 735	GORTER, HERMAN— The Great Strike on the Rail- ways in Holland..... 587
BAMFORD, FREDERICK IRONS— The Proletaire and the Trusts.. 609	HAGERTY, THOMAS J.— Semi-Annual Report of the Na- tional Committee of the Social- ist Party 224
BERLIN "VORWAERTS"— The Struggle with Tuberculosis In Germany 480	Socialism vs. Fads..... 440
BERNSTEIN, EDWARD— A Correction 360	HIRSCHFIELD, DR. A.— Social Effects of the Eight-Hour Day 610
BREHOLTZ, EDWIN ARNOLD— Begging! for Work (Poem)..... 273	HITCH, MARCUS— Workingmen as Judges..... 641
To Socialism 615	HITCHCOCK, CHARLES C.— The Economics of Socialism and the Economics of Capitalism.. 581
Just to Think (Poem)..... 718	HOEHN, G. A.— American Labor Movement..... 401
Discharged 731	HYNDMAN, H. M.— The International Situation..... 129
BUCK, RAPHAEL— Individualistic Survivals Under Socialism 275	Laborism, Impossibilism and So- cialism 653
BURROWES, PETER— Capitalism and the Ethical Move- ment 343	"JULIAN"— Some Free Legal Advice..... 709
COLEMAN, WILLIAM MACON— Socialism in Politics..... 477	KAUTSKY, KARL— The Two Tendencies..... 36
CHANDLER, LUCINDA B.— The Unity of Life..... 460	Agitation Among Farmers..... 148
CROSBY, ERNEST— The War of Secession..... 45	Forms and Weapons of Social Revolution 333
The Land of the Noonday Night (Song) 133	KENT, REV. ALEX.— Causes of Social Progress..... 657
DEBS, EUGENE V.— The Western Labor Movement.. 257	KING, MURRAY E.— Why Co-operatives Have Failed. 385
DOBBS, CHARLES— A Question for the Agitator..... 464	KUNZE, E. H.— Socialism in Australla..... 161
ENGELS, FREDERICK— A Retrospect 1	LAFONTAINE, H.— Socialism and Solidarity..... 97
EVERETT, OLIVER— A Correction 680	LEONARD, GEO. B.— Government by Injunction..... 212
FERRI, ENRICO— The Revolutionary Method..... 135	LEWIS, AUSTIN— Kautsky on the Trade Crisis... 286
FERRIS, Z. C.— The Dogma of a Cause World... 296	The Church and the Proletarian. 465
Restricted Interpretation 674	Reply to Prof. Seligman..... 667
FRANZ, J. R.— History of the United States (Concluded) 39-44	The Revolt of the Artist..... 720

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

FEB 13 1980

LONGUET, JEAN— The Socialist Party of France After the Elections..... 15	ROYSE, CLARENCE ARTHUR— Some Reflections on the French Revolution 595
LONDON, JACK— Wanted: A New Law of Devel- opment 654 Contradictory Teachers 648	RUBINOW, DR. I. M. — How Much Have the Trusts Ac- complished? 193 Edward Bernstein and Indus- trial Concentration 486 The Industrial Development of the South 513
LOVEJOY, OWEN R.— Jesus and Social Freedom..... 165	ST. LOUIS ARBEITER ZEITUNG— Organized Labor and the Militia 540
MAC DONALD, J. RAMSAY— Labor Politics in Great Britain... 713	SECRETARY INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE— The Conference of the Interna- tional Committee 482
MC., W. S.— Property Rights and the Coal Miners' Strike 321	SERWY, VICTOR— Events in Russia..... 86 International Socialist Congress of Amsterdam 484
MACKAY, H. W. BOYD— The Historical Study of Sociol- ogy 550	SIMONS, A. M.— Socialism and the American Farmer 201 Is It a Short Cut?..... 356 Bishop Spaulding on Socialism.. 395 Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid"..... 544 The Rural Exodus..... 737
MAILLY, WILLIAM— The Anthracite Coal Strike..... 79 Special Organizing Fund..... 683	SIMONS, MAY WOOD— Democracy and Education..... 89 The Economic Interpretation of History 530
MANN, HORACE— Ideals and Shortcomings of So- ciety 473	SLOBODIN, H. L.— Terrorism in Russia..... 143
"MARXIST"— Mr. Hennessy's Philosophy..... 218 A Patent Medicine for Trusts... 454 The Taff Vale Decision and In- corporation of Trades Unions. 577	SOSSO, LORENZO— Forges of the Nations..... 608
MILLER, W. H.— A Defense of the Old Law..... 291	STEDMAN, SEYMOUR— Immediate Demands 25
MILLS, WALTER THOMAS— Don't Go to a Convention—Go to Work 357	UNTERMANN, ERNEST— A German Municipal Program.. 347
MURRAY, JOHN, JR.— Who Said Scab?..... 412 Reply to Comrade Everett..... 681	VINCK, EMILE— Belgian Municipal Committee... 606
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMIT- TEE— Report of the Committee..... 537	WILDER, ISABEL N.— A Tenement Mother (Poem).... 231
NATIONAL MUNICIPAL COMMIT- TEE— Suggestions for Socialist Mu- nicipal Action 328	WILKINS, M. W.— The California Situation..... 416
NEUE ZEIT— The Three Crises of Marxism... 725	WILSHIRE, H. GAYLORD— Economic Development and So- cialist Tactics 30
OTT, F. W.— Concerning the Labor Union.... 107	WRIGLEY, G. WESTON— Possibility of Socialism in China 705
PEMBERTON, CAROLINE— The Patriot (Poem)..... 420	
RIVES, GEO. W.— A Short Cut..... 354	

DEPARTMENTS

THE WORLD OF LABOR—

Max S. Hayes.....54, 120, 184, 243,
306, 370, 436, 500, 563, 621, 688, 748

EDITORIALS—

A. M. Simons.

Socialism and the Trade Union Movement	46
Lines of Division in American Socialism	109
Concentration and Industries	72
A Discordant Note	232
The Coal Strike	298
International Socialist Congress	300
Socialism and the Election	361
Trades Unions and the Socialist Party	426
Violence and the Socialist Movement	490
The International Congress	491
Observation of Present Party Affairs	559
United Mine-Workers' Victory	618
The Call for Organization	686
Our Real Antagonist	745

SOCIALISM ABROAD—

Ernest Untermann.

Belgium	50, 630
France.....51, 179, 242, 302, 368, 496,	630
New Zealand	53, 495
On the March	115
Germany.....180, 238, 366, 430, 494,	693
Russia	181, 365
Austria-Hungary	182
Luxemburg	182
Italy	182, 240, 369, 498
South Africa	183
Brazil	183
England	239, 628
Norway	241
Switzerland....242, 305, 369, 497, 630,	696
Holland	242, 498, 626, 697
Japan	242
Sweden	499, 630
Austria	694
Finland	695
Hungary	737
Australia	750

BOOK REVIEWS—

A. M. Simons.

Chapters in the History of the Arts and Crafts Movements; Oscar Lovell Triggs	58
A Persian Pearl; Clarence S. Darrow	60
Britain for the British; Robert Blatchford	60
Crime and Its Relation to Social Progress; Arthur Cleveland Hall	60
The Socialist Movement; Rev. Charles H. Vail	61
The Truth About Socialism; John Collins	124
Tales from Gorki; Maxim Gorki	124
Die Geschichte und Litteratur der deutschen sozialdemokratie in ihren Hauptzuegen; Von Paul Kamffmeyer	125

The Americanization of the World, the Trend of the Twentieth Century; W. T. Stead	
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings; Helena Bond	
Perfecting the Earth; C. W. Woodbridge	
The Origin of the Family; Frederic Engels	
Trying to Cheat God; Marcus W. Robbins	
Pages of Socialist History; W. Tcherkesoff	
Social Revolution; Karl Kautsky ...	
The Collapse of Plutocracy; Henry Boothman	
La Cite Future; E. Tarbouriech.....	
Walt Whitman — The Poet of the Wider Selfhood; Mila Tupper Maynard	
The New Empire; Brooks Adams ...	
Our Benevolent Feudalism; W. J. Ghent	
Career and Conversation of John Swinton; Robert Waters	
Social Problems of the Farmer	
Michigan Political Science Association Resist Not Evil; Clarence S. Darrow	
William Morris, Poet, Craftsman, Socialist; Elizabeth Luther Cary	
The Spirit of the Ghetto; Hutchinson Hapgood	
The Conquest; Eva Emery Dye	
Swords and Ploughshares; Ernest Crosby	
The Coming City; Richard T. Ely....	
Economic Tangles; Judson Grenell..	
A Daughter of the Snows; Jack London	
Economic Interpretation of History Prof. Edwin R. A. Sellgman	
Co-Instructive and Preventive Philanthropy; Joseph Lee	
The Social Unrest; John Graham Woods	
Shrouds with Pockets; Henry E. Allen	
The Municipality from Capitalism to Socialism; Ernest Untermann	
When John Bull Comes A-Courtin'; Lucien V. Rule	
Introduction to Socialism; M. A. Richardson	
Referendum and Initiative in City Movements; John R. Commons	
The Pit; Frank Norris	
The American Cotton Industry; T. M. Young	
"What I Saw in South Africa;" J. Ramsay McDonald	
Tactics and Strategy; Thomas Berford	
God's Children; A Modern Allegory by James Allman	
Feuerbach; The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy; Frederick Engels ...	
Journal of Arthur Stirling	

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JULY, 1902.

NO. 1.

A RETROSPECT.

Lessons Drawn from the Socialist Movement from 1848 to 1895.



AS the February revolution of 1848 broke out we were all, as regards our views of the conditions and course of revolutionary movements, under the influence of previous historical experience, especially that of France. It was just this latter which had controlled all European history since 1789 and from which now once more the signal for a general upheaval had gone out. Hence it was natural and inevitable that our ideas of the nature and course of the "social" revolution proclaimed at Paris in February, 1848, the revolution of the proletariat, were strongly colored by recollections of the prototypes of 1789 to 1830. And particularly, as the Paris revolt found its echo in the victorious uprisings at Vienna, Milan, Berlin; as all Europe up to the Russian border was swept into the movement; as then in June at Paris the first great battle for supremacy was fought between proletariat and bourgeoisie; as even the victory of their own class so convulsed the bourgeoisie of all countries that they flew back again into the arms of the monarchic-feudal reactionists whom they had just overthrown; under all these circumstances there could be no doubt in our minds that the great decisive conflict had begun, and that it would have to be fought out in a single long revolutionary period with varying success, but that it could only end in the final victory of the proletariat.

After the defeats of 1849 we did not by any means share in the illusions of the political pseudo-democracy which was grouped around the outskirts of the provisional governments. This was counting on an early, once for all, decisive victory of the "people" over the "oppressors;" we were counting on a long struggle after the removal of the oppressors, a struggle between the antagonistic elements hidden in this very "people" itself. The pseudo-democracy was expecting from day to day a renewed outbreak; we declared as early as in autumn 1850 that at least the first chapter of

the revolutionary period was closed and that nothing more was to be expected until the outbreak of a new economic world crisis. And for this very reason, too, we were excommunicated as traitors to the revolution by the same people who afterwards almost without exception made their peace with Bismarck,—so far as Bismarck found them worth having.

But history has shown that we, too, were wrong, and has exposed our view at that time as an illusion; it has done more; it has not only demolished our error, it has also totally recast the conditions under which the proletariat has to fight. The 1848 method of warfare is to-day antiquated in every particular, and that is a point which at this opportunity deserves to be more closely examined.

All previous revolutions resulted in the displacement of one class government by another. All previous ruling classes were, however, only small minorities compared with the subject mass of the common people. A ruling minority was overthrown, in its stead another minority seized the helm of state, and remodeled the political institutions according to its own interests. In every case this new minority group was one which the progress of economic development had trained for and called to rulership. and for that very reason and only for that reason, it happened that at the time of the revolution the subject majority either took sides with it or at any rate acquiesced in it. But ignoring the concrete details of each particular case, the common form of all these revolutions was this, that they were minority revolutions. Even when the majority assisted, it was, consciously or unconsciously, only working in the interest of a minority; this fact, or even the passive non-resistance of the majority, gave to the minority the appearance of being the representative of the whole people.

After the first great victory the successful minority as a rule became divided; half was satisfied with what was already won, the other half wished to go farther yet and made new demands, which at least in part were in the real or apparent interest of the great mass of the people. These more radical demands were in particular instances carried through, but for the most part only temporarily; the more moderate party again got the upper hand, the latest gains were wholly or partly lost again. The radicals then raised the cry of "treason," or attributed their defeat to accident. In fact, however, matters stood about so:—the results of the first victory were made secure only by another victory over the more radical party. This done, and thereby the immediate demands of the moderates being attained, the radicals and their following disappeared again from the stage.

All the revolutions of modern times, beginning with the great

English revolution of the seventeenth century, showed these features, which seemed inseparable from every revolutionary struggle. They appeared to be also applicable to the struggles of the proletariat for its emancipation; all the more applicable, as in 1848 the few people could be counted who understood even in a general way the direction in which this emancipation was to be sought. The proletarian masses themselves even in Paris after the victory were still absolutely in the dark as to the course to pursue. And yet the movement was there, instinctive, spontaneous, irrepressible. Was not that exactly the condition in which a revolution was bound to succeed, though led, it is true, by a minority, but this time not in the interest of a minority, but in the truest interest of the majority. If in all the more prolonged revolutionary periods the great masses of the people had been so easily won over by the merely plausible inducements of ambitious minorities, how could they be less accessible to ideas which were the purest reflex of their economic situation, which were nothing else but the clear, intelligent expression of their own wants, wants as yet not understood by themselves and only indistinctly felt? It is true this revolutionary temper of the masses had nearly always and generally very soon given way to lassitude or even to a reaction into the opposite attitude, as soon as the illusion had vanished and undeception had taken place.

Here, however, it was not a question of dazzling offers merely, but a question of promoting the most vital interests of the great majority itself,—interests which, it is true, at that time were by no means clearly seen by this great majority, but which in the course of practical enforcement were bound soon enough to become clear to it by the convincing force of experience. And now when in the spring of 1850 the development of the bourgeois republic which arose out of the “social” revolution of 1848 had concentrated all actual power in the hands of the great-bourgeoisie, and this having monarchical inclinations too; and when on the other hand this same development had grouped all other classes of society, both peasants and small-bourgeoisie, around the proletariat in such a way that in and after the joint victory the controlling factor would be, not those others, but the proletariat itself, grown sharp-witted through experience—was there not every prospect at hand for turning a minority revolution into a majority revolution?

History has shown that we, and all who thought like us, were wrong. It has made it plain that the condition of economic development on the continent at that time was not yet ripe enough by far for the abolition of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which since 1848 has transformed the whole continent and has for the first time effectively naturalized

large-scale industry in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and, more recently, in Russia, while out of Germany it has actually made an industrial state of the first rank,—all on a capitalist basis, which system therefore in 1848 was still capable of great expansion. Moreover, it is just this industrial revolution which first brought about clearness everywhere in class relations; which shoved aside a lot of middle men who had come down from the early manufacturing period and in eastern Europe even from the guild system; which created a genuine bourgeoisie and a genuine factory proletariat and pushed them to the front place in the social development. Thereby, however, the struggle of these two great classes, a struggle which in 1848 existed outside of England only in Paris, and at most in some few great industrial centers, has spread for the first time over all Europe and reached an intensity which in 1848 was inconceivable. Then there were many confused sectarian gospels with their different panaceas; to-day the single transparently clear and universally recognized theory of Marx, which sharply formulates the ultimate aims of the struggle; then, masses separated and differentiated by locality and nationality, bound together only by a feeling of common suffering, undeveloped, tossed helplessly back and forth between enthusiasm and despair; to-day one great international army of socialists, unceasingly advancing, daily growing in numbers, organization, discipline, intelligence and certainty of victory. If even this mighty army of the proletariat has not yet attained its object, if far from wresting victory at one grand stroke, it has to press slowly forward from one position to another in a hard, tenacious struggle, this proves once for all how impossible it was in 1848 to effect the transformation of society by a mere sudden onslaught.

A bourgeoisie, split into two dynastic monarchical factions, but which demanded before everything else peace and security for its financial transactions; confronting it a proletariat, conquered but still threatening, and around which the small-tradesmen and peasants were grouping themselves more and more; the constant threatening of a violent outbreak, which after all offered no prospect of a final solution,—that was the situation fitted as if made to order, for the forcible usurpation of the pseudo-democratic pretender, Louis Bonaparte, y-clept the Third. On December 2, 1851, with the aid of the army, he put an end to the strained situation and secured internal peace for Europe in order to beatify it with a new era of wars. The period of revolutions from the bottom up was for the time being closed; there followed a period of revolution from the top down.

The set back of 1851 towards imperialism gave new proof of the unripeness of the proletarian aspirations of that time. But it was itself destined to create the conditions under which they

must ripen. Internal peace secured the full development of the new industrial life; the necessity of keeping the army busy and of turning the revolutionary activities away from home engendered wars in which Bonaparte under the pretense of giving effect to the "nationality principle," sought to rake up annexations to France. His imitator, Bismarck, adopted the same policy for Prussia; he played his political grab-game, his revolution from the top, in 1866 against the German confederation and Austria, and not less against the recalcitrant Chamber of Deputies in Prussia. But Europe was too small for two Bonapartes, and so the irony of history would have it that Bismarck should overthrow Bonaparte and that King William of Prussia should restore not only the small-German empire, but also the French republic. The general result, however, was this, that in Europe the autonomy and inner unity of the large nations, with the exception of Poland, had become a reality; true, it was only within relatively modest limits, but yet far enough so that the developing process of the working class was no longer materially hindered by national complications. The grave diggers of the revolution of 1848 had become the executors of its will; and beside them arose the proletariat, the heir of 1848, already threatening, in the Internationale.

After the war of 1870-1871, Bonaparte disappears from the stage and Bismarck's mission is completed, so that he can now subside again to the level of an ordinary country squire. But the closing act of this period is formed by the Paris Commune. A treacherous attempt by Thiers to steal the cannons of the Paris National Guard called forth a successful revolt. It was again demonstrated that in Paris no other revolution is possible any more, except a proletarian one. After the victory the leadership fell uncontested into the lap of the working class, just as a matter of course. And again it was shown how impossible it was even then, twenty years after the former effort, for the leadership of the working class to be successful. On one hand France left Paris in the lurch and stood by looking on while it was bleeding under the bullets of McMahon; on the other hand the Commune wasted its strength in a barren quarrel of the two disagreeing factions, the Blanquists, who formed the majority, and the Proudhonists, who formed the minority, neither of which knew what to do. The victory of 1871, which came as a gift, proved just as barren as the forcible overthrow of 1848.

With the fall of the Paris Commune it was thought that the militant proletariat was everlastingly buried past resurrection. But quite to the contrary, its most vigorous growth dates from the Commune and the Franco-Prussian war. The complete transformation of the whole military system by bringing the entire able-bodied population into the armies, now running up into the

millions, and by the introduction of firearms, cannon and explosives of hitherto unheard of power, put a sudden end to the Napoleonic war era and assured a peaceful industrial development by making impossible any war other than a world war of unprecedented gruesomeness and of absolutely incalculable consequences. On the other hand, the increase of the army budget in a geometrical progression forced the taxes up to an uncollectible point, and thereby drove the poorer classes into the arms of socialism. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, which was the immediate cause of the mad competition in preparations for war, might goad the French and German bourgeoisie into chauvinism towards each other; but for the workingmen of both countries it was only a new bond of unity. And the anniversary of the Paris Commune became the first general holiday of the entire proletariat.

The war of 1870-1871 and the overthrow of the Commune had, as Marx foretold, shifted the center of gravity of the European labor movement for the present from France to Germany. In France it took, of course, years to recover from the blood-letting of May, 1871. In Germany, on the contrary, where industry was developing faster and faster, forced on in hothouse fashion by the providential milliards from France, the social democracy was growing faster yet and more enduring. Thanks to the intelligence with which the German workingmen made use of the universal suffrage, introduced in 1866, the astounding growth of the party is revealed to all in incontestable figures. In 1871, 102,000 social democratic votes; in 1874, 352,000; in 1877, 493,000. Then came the high official recognition of these gains in the shape of the anti-socialist law. The party was for a moment demoralized; the number of votes in 1881 fell to 312,000. But that relapse was soon overcome, and then under the pressure of the anti-socialist law, and without a press, without a recognized organization, without the right of association or of assembly, the growth began to increase more rapidly than ever. In 1884, 550,000 votes! in 1887, 763,000; in 1890, 1,427,000. Then the hand of the state was palsied. The anti-socialist law disappeared; the number of socialist votes rose to 1,787,000, over a quarter of the total votes cast. The government and the ruling classes had exhausted all their expedients; they were useless, aimless, resultless. The tangible proofs of their impotence which the authorities, from night watchman to imperial chancellor, got shoved under their noses and that, too, from the despised workingmen, were numbered by millions. The state had got to the end of its Latin, the workingmen were only at the beginning of theirs.

Moreover, in addition to this, the German workingmen had

done their cause a second great service, besides the first one, consisting merely in their existence as the strongest, best disciplined, and most rapidly growing Socialist party; they had shown their comrades of all countries a new weapon, and one of the keenest, in showing them how to use the ballot.

Universal suffrage had long existed in France, but had come into disrepute through the misuse which the Napoleonic government had made for it. After the Commune there was no labor party in existence to make use of it. In Spain, too, it had existed since the republic, but in Spain it was always the custom of all the real opposition parties to refrain from voting. And in Switzerland, too, the experiences with universal suffrage were anything but encouraging for a labor party. The revolutionary workingmen of the Romance countries had become accustomed to look upon the ballot as a snare, as an instrument of oppression manipulated by the government. In Germany it was different. The Communist Manifesto had already proclaimed the winning of universal suffrage, of democracy, as one of the first and most important tasks of the militant proletariat, and Lassalle had taken up this point again. And when Bismarck saw that he was forced to introduce this franchise as the only means of getting the masses interested in his plans, our workingmen at once took the matter seriously and sent August Bebel into the first constitutional convention. And from that day on they have used the ballot in a manner that has repaid them a thousand fold and has served as an example to the workingmen of all countries. They have transformed the ballot, in the words of the program of the French Marxians, "de moyen de duperie, qu'il a ete jusqu'ici, en instrument d'emancipation;" from a means of jugglery, which it has been heretofore, into an instrument of emancipation. And if universal suffrage had offered no other advantage than to allow us to count ourselves every three years; and by a regularly certified and unexpectedly rapid increase of votes to raise in equal degree the confidence of the workers and the terror of their opponents, and thus to become our best means of propaganda; and to inform us exactly as to our own strength and as to that of all opposing parties, and thereby give us a standard for proportioning our activity such as could not be equalled; and to save us both from untimely hesitation and from untimely rashness;—if that were the only benefit which we derived from the franchise, even then it would be enough and more than enough. But it has done far more. It gave us in election campaigns an unequalled opportunity to come in contact with the masses where they still stood aloof from us, and to force all parties to defend their views and actions before all the people against our attacks; and it also opened to our representatives in Parliament, a forum from which they could talk to their opponents in Parliament as well as to the

masses outside with an entirely different tone of authority and freedom from what they could use in the press and in meetings. What good did the anti-Socialist law do the government and the bourgeoisie so long as the election campaigns and the Socialist speeches in Parliament were continually nullifying it?

Moreover, with this successful use of the ballot, a wholly new method of proletarian warfare had gone into effect, which was rapidly extended. It was found that the political institutions, by means of which the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is organized, afford further handholds by which the working class can attack these very institutions. The party took part in the elections for State Legislatures, Aldermen and industrial courts and contested against the bourgeoisie for every office in the filling of which a sufficient number of the proletariat had anything to say. And thus it happened that the bourgeoisie and the government came to a pass where they feared the lawful activity of the labor party far more than its unlawful activity; it dreaded the results of an election more than those of a rebellion. For here, too, the conditions of the struggle had materially changed. The old style rebellion, the street fight with barricades, which down to 1848 gave the final decision everywhere, had become decidedly antiquated.

Let us harbor no illusions on this point; an actual victory of a revolt over the military force in a street fight, a victory as between two armies, is a thing of the rarest occurrence. Moreover, the insurgents had seldom aimed at this. Their only object was to soften the troops by moral influences, such as in a conflict between armies of two warring countries would be of no effect at all, or at any rate in a far smaller degree. If this plan succeeds the troops refuse to obey orders or the officers lose their presence of mind and the revolt is successful. If this plan does not succeed, nevertheless, even in case the military is fewer in numbers, the result shows the superiority of their better equipment and training, of the unified leadership, of the well-planned arrangement of forces and their discipline. The most that an insurrection can attain in real tactical action is the scientific construction and defense of a single barricade. Mutual support, the disposition and utilization of reserves, in short the assistance and co-operation of the separate divisions, which is indispensable for the defense even of a single district, to say nothing of the whole of a large city, is very imperfect, and for the most part wholly unattainable; concentration of forces upon a vital point is out of the question. A passive defense is the characteristic form of the struggle. The attack will extend here and there to occasional sallies or flank movements, but only as exceptions, for as a rule it will be confined to occupying the positions abandoned by the

retiring troops. Then, further, the military is supplied with artillery and with completely equipped and trained battalions of pioneers which the insurgents in almost all cases wholly lack. No wonder, therefore, that even those barricade fights which were conducted with the most heroic bravery, as at Paris in June, 1848, at Vienna in October, 1848, and at Dresden in May, 1849, ended with the suppression of the revolt as soon as the officers of the army, unhampered by political considerations, fought according to purely military principles and the soldiers remained trustworthy.

The numerous successes of insurgents down to 1848 are due to very manifold causes. At Paris in July, 1830, and in February, 1848, as also in most of the Spanish street fights, there stood between the insurgents and the military a citizens' guard, which either sided directly with the revolt or by its lukewarm and hesitating attitude caused the regular troops also to waver, and in addition to that, furnished the insurgents with arms. Wherever this civil guard at the start took a stand against the revolt, as in June, 1848, at Paris, the insurgents were defeated. At Berlin, in 1848, the people won partly through an important addition of fresh forces during the night and on the morning of the 19th of March, partly on account of the fatigue and lack of care suffered by the troops, and partly on account of the hesitation of the authorities. But in all cases where a victory was won it was because the troops mutinied, or because the officers were lacking in determination, or because their hands were tied.

Therefore, even in the classical period of street fighting, the barricade was more of a moral than a material force. It was a means for breaking the loyalty of the army. If it accomplished this, the victory was won; if not, the cause was lost.

Even in 1849 the chances were already poor enough. The bourgeoisie everywhere had gone over to the side of the governments; "culture and property" greeted and treated the troops marching out against the insurgents. The barricade had lost its charm. The soldiers no longer saw behind it the "people," but only rebels, rioters, plunderers, "dividers-up," the outcasts of society; the officers had in time become skilled in the tactical forms of street fighting; they no longer marched out straight ahead and unprotected against the improvised breastworks, but went around them through gardens, courts and houses. And this course, with a little skill, was successful in nine cases out of ten.

And since then many things have changed and all to the advantage of the military. Though the large cities have become larger, so also have the armies. Paris and Berlin have not quadrupled since 1848, but their garrisons have been increased more than that. By means of the railroads these garrisons can be dou-

bled in twenty-four hours, and in forty-eight hours can be expanded into gigantic armies. The weapons of these enormous hosts are incomparably more effective than formerly. In 1848 they had only the smooth bore, percussion-cap, muzzle-loader; to-day the small calibre magazine breech-loader, which shoots four times as far, ten times as accurate, and ten times as fast as the other. At that time they had only the comparatively ineffective solid balls and cartridges of the artillery; to-day the percussion shells, a single one of which is sufficient to demolish the strongest barricade. At that time the pick of the pioneer for breaking through walls; to-day the dynamite bomb.

On the other hand, for the insurgents, all the conditions have become worse. A revolt with which all layers of the population sympathize can hardly come again. In the class struggle all the middle layers of society will probably never rally around the proletariat so exclusively that the reactionary party which rallies to the bourgeoisie will almost disappear. The "people" therefore will always appear to be divided, and thereby a powerful lever is wanting which was so exceedingly effective in 1848. Even if more trained soldiers are found on the side of the insurgents, it will be so much the more difficult to arm them. The hunters' and sportsmen's guns from the retail stores, even if the police should not have rendered them unserviceable by removing part of the lock as a precautionary measure, cannot by any means compete with the magazine gun of the soldiers even at close range. Up to 1848 a man could manufacture the necessary ammunition himself out of powder and lead; but to-day the cartridge is different for every gun, and only in one particular is it alike everywhere, viz., in that it is a technical product of large scale industry, and therefore cannot be prepared extempore, and therefore the most of the guns are useless so long as one has not the ammunition specially fitted for them. Finally the new districts of the great cities have been laid out with long, straight, broad streets, as if made with special reference to operations with modern cannons and small arms. The revolutionist would be insane who would deliberately select the new workingmen's districts in the north and east of Berlin for a barricade fight.

Does the reader now understand why the ruling classes are so anxious by all means to get us where the rifle cracks and the saber slashes? And why they to-day accuse us of cowardice because we do not straightway betake ourselves to the street, where we are beforehand certain of a defeat? And why they so passionately beseech us to be good enough to play cannon fodder just for once?

These gentlemen are wasting both their prayers and their dares for nothing and less than nothing. We are not so green as

all that. They might just as well ask their enemy in the next war to follow the line formation used by Frederick the Great, or the formation in columns of entire divisions a la Wagram and Waterloo, and that, too, with the old flintlock gun in the hand. As conditions have changed for warfare, so not less for the class struggle. The period of sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where the question involves the complete transformation of the social organization, there the masses themselves must be consulted, must themselves have already grasped what the struggle is about and what they are to stand for. This is what the history of the last fifty years has taught us. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and persistent work is needed, and it is just this work that we are now doing, and that, too, with a success which drives our opponents to despair.

In the Latin countries also people see more and more that the old tactics have to be revised. They have everywhere followed the German example of using the ballot and of winning every position which is accessible to them. In France where the ground has been broken up for over 100 years by revolution upon revolution, where there is not a single party which has not furnished its share of conspiracies, insurrections and all other revolutionary doings; in France, where, as the result of this condition, the government is by no means certain of the army, and where the circumstances generally are far more favorable for an insurrectional venture than in Germany,—even in France the Socialists are coming to understand better and better that no enduring victory is possible for them unless they first win the great mass of the people;—that means there the peasants. Slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity are recognized there, too, as the next task of the party. The results were not lacking. Not only has a whole string of municipal councils been captured; even in the Chamber of Deputies there are fifty Socialists, and these have already overthrown three Cabinets and one President of the republic. In Belgium last year the workingmen forced the granting of the electoral franchise and won in a fourth of the voting districts. In Switzerland, in Italy, in Denmark, yes, even in Bulgaria and Roumania, the Socialists are represented in Parliament. In Austria all parties are agreed that our entrance into the imperial council can no longer be prevented. We are bound to get in, that is certain; the only question yet is, by what door? And even in Russia whenever the celebrated Zemskij Sobor shall be assembled, that national convention which young Nicholas is trying in vain to prevent, we can count on it with certainty that we shall be represented there too.

It goes without saying that our foreign comrades do not relinquish their right of revolution. The right of revolution is after all the only actually "historical right," the only right upon which all modern states without exception rest, including even Mecklenburg, whose revolution of the nobility was ended in 1755 by the inheritance agreement,—that glorious charter of feudalism which is still in force to-day. The right of revolution is so irrefutably recognized in the public consciousness that General von Boguslawski out of this popular right alone derives the right of forcible usurpation which he justifies on behalf of the Emperor.

But whatever may happen in other countries, the German social democracy occupies a particular position, and hence has at least for the present a particular task. The two million voters which it sends to the ballot box, together with the young men and the women who, as non-voters, stand behind them, constitute the largest and compactest mass, the decisive corps of the international proletarian army. This mass furnishes already over a quarter of the votes cast; and it grows unceasingly, as shown by the elections for the Reichstag, for the separate state legislatures; for the municipal councils and for the industrial courts. Its growth goes on as spontaneously, steadily, and uninterruptedly, and at the same time as quietly as a process of nature. All the efforts of the government against it have shown themselves to be futile. We can to-day count on two and a quarter million voters. If that keeps up, we shall by the end of the century win the greater part of the middle strata of society, both small tradesmen and peasants, and shall become the determining power in the land before which all other powers must bow down, whether they want to or not. To keep this growth going uninterruptedly until of itself it overtops the prevailing system of government, is our chief task. And there is only one means by which this steady increase of the militant Socialist forces in Germany could be momentarily checked and even set back for a time, viz., a conflict with the army on a large scale, a blood-letting like that of 1871 at Paris. In the long run even this would be overcome. Take a party which runs up into the millions and all the magazine guns of Europe and America together would not be sufficient to shoot it out of existence. But the normal development would be checked, and the end of the conflict would be delayed, prolonged and accompanied with heavier sacrifices.

The irony of history turns everything upside down. We, the "revolutionists," the "revolvers," prosper far better by lawful measures than by unlawful measures and violence. The law and order parties, as they call themselves, go to ruin under the legal conditions which they themselves have established. They cry out in despair with Odilon Barrot; *la legalite nous tue*, "lawfulness

is killing us;" while we, under this lawfulness are getting firm muscles and rosy cheeks and are the picture of eternal life. And if we do not so completely lose our wits as to let ourselves be drawn into a street fight just to please them, then there remains nothing else for them to do finally except to break down this lawfulness themselves, which has proved so disadvantageous to them.

For the present they are making new laws against revolts. Again everything is turned upside down. These anti-revolt fanatics of to-day, are they not themselves the revolvers of yesterday? For example, did we conjure up the civil war of 1866? Did we drive the King of Hanover, the electoral Prince of Hessen, the Duke of Nassau from their legitimate and hereditary lands, and then annex these countries? And now these smashers of the German confederation and of three grace-of-God crowns complain about revolt! *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?* Who could permit Bismarck's worshipers to complain about revolting?

Meanwhile let them pass their anti-revolt laws, and make them still more stringent; let them turn the whole criminal code into caoutchouc; they will accomplish nothing except to furnish new proof of their impotence. In order to get at the social democracy effectively they will have to take entirely different measures. The social democratic revolt, which just now finds its greatest advantage in observing the laws, can only be checked by a counter-revolt of the law and order party which cannot exist without breaking the laws. Herr Roessler, the Prussian bureaucrat, and Herr von Boguslawski, the Prussian general, have pointed out to them the only way by which perhaps they can yet get even with the workingmen who will not let themselves be enticed into a street fight, breach of the constitution, dictatorship, a return to absolutism, *regis voluntas suprema lex!* Courage, therefore, gentlemen, no lip-puckering will answer here; you have got to whistle!

But do not forget that the German empire, as well as all the small states composing it, and in general all modern states, are the product of a treaty: a treaty first of the princes among themselves, second of the princes with the people. If one side breaks the treaty, the whole treaty falls, and the other side is then no longer bound either.

It is now 1600 years ago, almost to a year, that likewise a dangerous revolutionary party was carrying on its work in the Roman empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state. It denied absolutely that the will of the Emperor was the supreme law; it was fatherlandless, international; it spread out over all parts of the empire, from Gaul to Asia, and even beyond the limits of the empire. It had for a long time worked under-

ground and in secret, but for some time past it considered itself strong enough to come out openly into the light. This revolutionary party, which was known by the name of Christians, also had a large representation in the army. Whole legions were Christian. When they were ordered to attend the sacrifice ceremonies of the established heathen religion to perform the honors of the occasion, the revolutionary soldiers carried their impudence so far that by way of protest they stuck into their helmets peculiar emblems—crosses. Even the customary floggings by the officers, with the cat-o'-nine tails of the barracks, were fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian was no longer able to look quietly on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being subverted. He took hold energetically while there was yet time. He issued an anti-Socialist,—or, rather, an anti-Christian—law. Assemblies of the revolvers were forbidden, their meeting halls closed or even torn down, the Christian emblems, crosses, etc., were forbidden the same as red handkerchiefs in Saxony. Christians were declared incapable of holding state offices, and could not even become lance corporals in the army. As they did not yet have at that time judges so carefully trained to observe a "respect for the person" as contemplated by Herr von Koeller's anti-revolt bill, the Christians were forbidden outright to resort to the courts at all. This exception law also proved ineffective. The Christians tore it down from the walls with contempt, aye, it is said that while the Emperor was in Nicomedia they set fire to the palace over his head. He revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians which took place in the year 303 of our era. It was the last of its kind; and it was so effective that seventeen years later the majority of the army consisted of Christians and the next succeeding monarch of the whole Roman empire, Constantine, called by the priests the Great, proclaimed Christianity as the state religion.

Frederich Engels.

(Being the introduction to Marx's Class Struggles in France.)

Translated by Marcus Hitch.

London, March 6, 1895.

The Socialist Party of France After the Elections.

REGARDING the general elections which took place in France on April 27 and May 11 of this year, our American comrades have certainly had thus far only incomplete and contradictory reports. Especially everything that has to do with the situation of our party has been transmitted to them through bourgeois agencies, very skillful in concealing our successes when we were victorious and still more so in magnifying our defeats when we were beaten.

In places where Socialism is still in its first stage of propaganda, where it appears new-born, and shows as yet no great expansive force, it may enter into electoral contests without taking more than slight account of the general political situation. But where, as in France, the Socialist party has become an important factor in the national life, it is obliged to take account of the immediate results of its acts and its tactics, to take political contingencies into consideration and to act accordingly.

In Europe, where there are still vestiges of the regimes of absolute monarchy, feudalism and clerical reaction, the Socialist party is obliged to distinguish between the enemies of the working class and to support the "advanced" sections of the bourgeoisie against the reactionary sections. Not even the most uncompromising of our comrades, whose conception has reached the greatest doctrinal rigidity,—not even these escape this common law, whether it be our Socialist brothers of Germany, allied with the progressives against the agrarians, our Belgian comrades united with the liberals against the clericals, our friends of Italy allied with the radicals, the progressives and the republicans against the reactionaries, or, again, our friends Hyndman, Quelch and Keir Hardie in England, struggling against the Tories by the side of radicals like Morley and the Irish Nationalist party,—everywhere it is the same phenomena that we recognize.

And by the way, Marx and Engels said as long ago as 1867 that the Socialist proletariat should always support the liberal section of the bourgeoisie "as often as it acted in a revolutionary fashion against absolute monarchy, bourgeois landed property and the petty bourgeoisie."

But we must needs be clear-headed when we speak of union with the bourgeois parties, and not confuse the two ideas of a momentary and provisional coalition with the advanced parties of the bourgeoisie and on the other hand of a permanent understanding, a normal alliance, not actuated by anything exceptional, and which might even end, as in the case with our ministerial-

ists in France, in the conception of a permanent participation by the Socialists in the central power of the bourgeoisie.

Between these two conceptions there is a deep gulf. The former permits Socialism to maintain its integrity as a party clearly distinct from all bourgeois parties; it permits it to pursue its own work of awakening in the laborers a clear-cut sense of the fundamental antagonism which exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It has led the Socialist parties of Germany, Belgium, Austria and Italy from victory to victory. The second conception, on the contrary, ends in setting up the idea of collaboration of classes as opposed to the class struggle, while for the clear and definite concept of the organization of the proletariat it substitutes the worst sort of confusion.

France was precipitated into the last electoral contest while in the gravest sort of a political situation. The great landed proprietors, the larger portion of the industrial capitalists, the feudal and clerical elements more or less opposed to the republican regime and desirous of re-establishing the monarchy,—all these had formed themselves into a formidable coalition to get control of the government and to use it at once against the bourgeois republican parties and against organized labor. It was under the mask of patriotism, working artfully on national sentiment, that the party calling itself "Nationalist" was thus established. It comprised the old Orleanist, Bonapartist and clerical Ultramontane parties, and also certain chauvinistic elements of the small bourgeoisie, like those called Jingoists in England, who declared with great vehemence that "'republicans' and 'democrats' are only other names for Socialists." These elements had formed a powerful organization, the Ligue de la Patrie Française (French Patriotic League), which at Paris controlled several large and widely circulated newspapers. A league called "Les Dames Françaises" (French Ladies), formed by the elegant women of the aristocracy and the upper bourgeoisie, set itself about raising enormous sums of money for the expenses of the electoral campaign, and the money expended by the Ligue de la Patrie Française is estimated at more than \$5,000,000.

As for the Socialist party, its situation at the opening of the battle was bad enough. On the one side, the "ministerialist" Socialists had exaggerated their concern for defending public liberty up to the point of tolerating the worst compromises, and often to the point of confounding themselves with the bourgeois "democratic" parties and totally forgetting the duty that as intelligent Socialists they owe to their class. On the other hand, by a natural but deplorable reaction the "Guesdist" and "Blanquist" Socialists, who have formed another organization under the name of "Revolutionary Socialist Union," have often exhibited an "impossibilism" quite analogous to that of your Deleonites.

It is true that in fact these comrades of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," who had most bitterly declared their disdain for "republican defense," have, in presence of the facts, and once having entered on the electoral struggle, seen the need of acting more wisely. Apart from a few exceptional cases their attitude has been that of good and loyal Socialists, equally removed from compromises with the bourgeois parties and from clumsy acts of assistance to the parties of pure reaction.

The ministerialist Socialists thereupon greeted the Socialists of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" with raillery and sarcasm, and instead of congratulating them on the correction of their absurd exaggerations (like those of your "Deleonites"), they declared triumphantly that the "Guesdists" and "Blanquists," once entered on the electoral contest, and in order to hold or gain seats in Parliament, had abandoned all their former tactics. As I wrote in Comrade Enrico Ferri's handsome new review, *Il Socialismo*, for May 25, this was an act of bad faith on the part of the ministerialist Socialists.

The French electoral law, like that of the principal countries of Europe, England excepted, provides for two ballots. At the first there are three, four or even five candidates to be voted for. At the second there remain but two, the two who have received the highest number of votes. Sometimes these two candidates at the second ballot are, for example, a reactionary nationalist and a democratic bourgeois republican, and then the Socialist voters who at the first poll registered their votes for one of their own number, do not hesitate to vote at the second ballot for the bourgeois republican against the reactionary.

On the contrary, in another district, there remain at the second ballot only the Socialist and the reactionary. Our friends are then justified in appealing for the votes of those who at the first ballot voted for the bourgeois radical, who happens to be only third in number of votes and consequently disappears at the second ballot. That is what all the Socialists do and what was done for example by our comrade Delory, Mayor of Lille, candidate of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," and in reproaching him for it the ministerialist Socialists are, I repeat, acting in bad faith. The anti-ministerialists had never seriously reproached the others for these coalitions on the second ballot. What they had criticised is the theory of permanent participation on the part of the Socialists in the central power of the bourgeoisie, that is to say, ministerialism. Consequently the ministerialists have no right to say that the candidates of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" have done what they reproached the members of the "Parti Socialiste Français," or ministerialists, for doing.

The elections of April 27 and May 11 of the year have resulted

in a most complete check for the reactionary nationalists, and in spite of the enormous sums of money expended by them, in spite of the formidable effort that they made, the republican parties are completely victorious. The Socialists can only rejoice at this, for a victory of the reactionaries of the *Patrie Française* would have put back the progress of Socialism in France by at least ten years. It would have been impossible for our comrades for a long time to follow up the organization of the laborers as a class party; all their energy would have been called out by the work of defending political liberty represented in the bourgeois democracy.

This bitter struggle between republican and nationalist so complicated the task of our party that it was often difficult to proclaim clearly the ideas that are distinctively Socialist, or to bring the voting masses to consider them, under circumstances where the economic question was reduced to the second place.

Nevertheless our party has little to complain of in the issue of the struggle; if it has not made such considerable progress as it should have made, it has none the less increased its strength, and in certain regions its progress has been surprising.

The "ministerialist" tactics, the presence of an old member of the Socialist parliamentary group in the democratic but capitalist government of M. Waldeck-Rousseau, must according to the partisans of these tactics have brought over to our ideas innumerable masses of timid and artless voters. Socialism, which till then had passed for a doctrine of "savages," of people without hearth or home, now becoming governmental, "decent" and "polite," would convert to itself all those whom its revolutionary character had frightened away. That is an illusion common to all those who incline toward that dangerous tendency known as "State Socialism."

In France, when the election returns of this year came in, the awakening from their illusions must have been a rude shock for certain people. The Socialist gain, measured by the number of deputies in Parliament, or by the number of votes cast, is on the whole small, and where there is evident progress it is impossible to attribute it to the attraction exercised by "ministerialism." On the contrary, the districts where the progress of socialism is most marked are those where the tendencies of the active workers are clearly revolutionary.

In the department of the Iser, in the region of the Alps, where our ideas had brought together 72,861 votes in 1898, we had but 27,861 this year. But in the department of Saone et Loire, in the region of Lyons, where we had 2,069 votes in 1898, as a result of the great strikes of the miners of Montceau-les-Mines and of the metal workers of Crenot and Chalon, we now have 22,539. Again, the Loire, including the mining region of St. Etienne and

the textile region of Roannes increases its Socialist vote from 19,357 to 32,456.

In other regions where the Socialists have sacrificed more to ministerialism, as, for example, on the coast of the Mediterranean, our ideas have also progressed, but it is impossible to say that the ministerial tactics have been of advantage to the Socialists of these regions. On the contrary, it is certain that without the ministerialism their progress would have been greater.

Among these departments on the Mediterranean should be mentioned that of the Bouches du Rhone (around Marseilles) where we obtained 36,214 votes in 1898 and 43,868 this time, that of Gard, where we had, four years ago, 21,899 votes, and now 36,637; Herault, where we had 12,603 and now have 15,414; Var, where we had 16,792 votes and now count 19,569.

In the region of the north and of Paris, for various reasons, in the terrific assault of the reactionaries, socialist divisions, economic depression, we have in general simply maintained our positions.

In Paris (city and suburbs) we obtained 197,000 votes in 1898; we have 200,499 in 1902.* In the department of the North the Socialists polled 82,000 votes in 1898, this time 80,587. It is evident that in this great industrial region Socialism is not progressing as we might fairly have hoped. For this there are various reasons: alcoholism, the depressing force of the Catholic church, and the terrible tyranny exercised by the employers explain up to a certain point the slowness of our growth and this time a slight check. There are, however, other causes, and among them there must be some for which the Socialists themselves are responsible.

In another department of the northern region, that of Hisne, although the Socialist deputy of the district of Guise, Eugene Fourniere, was beaten, there was, nevertheless, a considerable increase in our vote, which passes from 12,213 to 17,600.

In the department of the Rhone, around Lyons, the progress realized by our party is also perceptible. Our vote increased from 28,181 to 32,397. Also at Cher, in the region of the Center, it increased from 16,596 to 20,309.

If we examine the different regions of France with regard to the Socialist vote and the vote obtained by each Socialist organi-

* In the Paris election returns in 1898 those who voted for such deputies as Pascal Grousset and Millerand were counted as Socialists, though the Socialism of the candidates can evidently be contested. However, the great majority of those who voted for them were Socialists. If we should subtract their votes from the total we should have in 1898 about 183,000 and in 1902, 189,200. The figures of the Socialist votes are made from the results of the first ballot, April 27, for the results of the second ballot do not admit of exact calculation,

zation, and if we class them accordingly, by the proportion of Socialist voters to the total number of inhabitants, we shall arrive at the following figures:

1. Region of the Mediterranean (departments of Bouches-du-Rhone, Gard, Var, Herault, Aude, Vaucluse), 2,470,000 inhabitants, and 132,671 Socialist votes, divided as follows:

66,520 for the Parti Socialiste Francais.

27,559 for the Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire.

33,210 for the Federations Autonomes (composed of Socialists who have preferred not to join either of the two large organizations.

2. Region of Lyons (Rhone, Loire, Saone-et-Loire), 2,100,000 inhabitants and 87,390 Socialist votes.

49,323 for the P. S. F.

34,025 for the U. S. R.

4,042 for the A.

3. Region du Nord (Nord Aisne, Pas de Calais, Somme), 3,995,000 inhabitants, and 153,200 Socialist votes, of which 63,688 were cast for the P. S. F., 80,921 for U. S. R., and 8,630 for the F. A.

4. Region du Centre (Cher, Allier, Indre), 1,110,000 inhabitants, and 48,148 Socialist votes, of which 15,277 were for the P. S. F., 30,201 for the U. S. R. and 2,670 for the F. A.

5. Region Parisienne (Seine, Seine et Oise, Oise, Eure et Loire, Seine et Marne), 5,286,000 inhabitants, and 214,100 Socialist votes, of which 89,066 were for the P. S. F., 85,067 for the U. S. R., and 28,961 for the F. A.

6. Region des Ardennes et de la Champagne (Ardennes, Marne, Aube, Haute Marne). 1,298,000 inhabitants, and 35,746 Socialist votes, of which 22,037 were for the P. S. F. and 13,581 for the U. S. R.

7. Region des Alpes (Isere, Hautes Alpes, Basses Alpes, Alpes Maritimes et Drome), 1,399,000 inhabitants, and 26,083 Socialist votes, of which none were for the P. S. F. (who have no organizations in this region), 22,483 were for the U. S. R. and 3,600 for the F. A.

8. Bourgogne et Jura (Côte d'or, Yonne, Ain, Jura, Nièvre), with 1,719,000 inhabitants, and 32,258 Socialist votes, of which 27,977 were for the P. S. F. and 2,077 for the U. S. R.

9. Region de la Saintonge et de Poitou (Deux-Sevres, Charente, Charent Inferieure, et Vienne), with 1,530,000 inhabitants, and 21,760 Socialist votes, of which 14,719 were for the P. S. F. and 6,991 for the U. S. R.

10. Region d'Auvergne et Haut Languedoc (Puy de Dome, Aveyron, Lozere, Haute Vienne), with 2,105,000 inhabitants, and 36,819 Socialist votes, of which 24,355 were for the P. S. F., 7,770 for the U. S. R., and 2,899 for the F. A.

11. Region de Vouraine, d'Anjou et du Maine (Indre et Loire, Lou et Cher, Maine et Loire, Mayenne, Sarthe, Loire), with 2,264,000 inhabitants, and 18,836 Socialist votes, of which 13,020 were for the P. S. F., 2,961 for the U. S. R., and 2,738 for the F. A.

12. Region Girondine (Gironde, Dordogne, Landes, Lot et Lot d' Garvin), with 2,178,000 inhabitants, and 18,499 Socialist votes, of which 8,320 were for the P. S. F. and 10,179 for the U. S. R.

13. Region des Pyrenees et Bas Languedoc (Haute Pyrenees, Basses Pyrenees, Pyrenees et Orientals, Haut Garonne, Gars), with 2,570,000 inhabitants, and 15,563 Socialist votes, of which 10,362 were for the P. S. F. and 5,178 for the U. S. R.

14. Normandie (Seine Inferieure, Eure, Calvados, Manche, Orne), with 2,470,000 inhabitants, and 12,845 Socialist votes, of which 12,222 were for the P. S. F. and 622 for the U. S. R.

15. Bretagne (Finisterre, Cotes du Nord, Morbihan, Ile et Vilaine, Loire Inferieure), with 3,215,000 inhabitants, and 18,091 Socialist votes, of which 2,750 were for the P. S. F., 2,493 for the U. S. R., and 12, 558 for the F. A.

16. Lorraine et Franche Comte, with 1,830,000 inhabitants, and 2,232 Socialist votes, of which 430 were for the P. S. F. and 1,830 for the U. S. R.

It occurred to me that this classification of France from a Socialist point of view might interest our American comrades, and especially the readers of the International Socialist Review, who enjoy scientific processes of analysis, precise facts and figures. I should add that until now this classification had not been made in France. It had been thought sufficient to give the enumeration of the Socialist votes, simply by departments. Now our departments, created a hundred years ago, during the Revolution, in an artificial fashion, do not always represent anything well defined. On the contrary the regions, such as I have enumerated them, correspond to characteristic historical formations, and represent actual groupings. This classification shows us that the regions of France where Socialism is strongest are the regions of the Mediterranean, of Lyons, the Center, the North and the region of Paris.

The truth is that the regions of Lyons, of the Center and of the North are especially characterized by a very clear class-consciousness on the part of their active Socialists. On the contrary, in the region of the Mediterranean, and that of Paris, the Socialist movement assumes the forms of an "advanced" movement, democratic and slightly Jacobin. In the Mediterranean region especially, the 132,000 Socialist voters are in great part not industrial laborers, but "democratic" peasants, quite republican in their ideas, and wishing to belong to the most "advanced" party, but

not always having a very clear idea of socialism. Thus for example, in the department of the Gard, where three out of six of the Deputies to Parliament are members of the Socialist group, most of the Socialist voters are small proprietors of Vignobles, in whose eyes the Socialist movement is a matter of politics rather than economics.

On the contrary, at Lyons, at St. Etienne, at Montceau les Mines, at Lille, at Roubaix, at Montlucon, and at Commentay, that is to say, in the regions of Lyons, the North and the Center, the Socialist voters, who number about 280,000, are mostly metal-workers, textile-workers and miners.

If we classify the Socialist votes according to organizations, we have the following results:

The "Parti Socialiste Français," which includes on the one hand the ministerialist Socialist elements and on the other hand some federations not ministerialist, but very closely allied, mustered 316,053 votes in the departments and 84,320 at Paris, a total of 432,373 votes.

The "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," which unites the old organizations of the "Parti Ouvrier Français" (Guesdists) and "Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire" (Blanquist), polled 262,050 votes in the provinces and 76,147 in Paris, in all 338,197.

The Federations which have remained independent and the old "Allemanist" organization ("Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire") received 67,961 at Paris, 96,602 in all.

We have thus a total of 863,159 Socialist votes; by adding the votes of candidates like Pascal Grousset and Millerand, which we have not counted, and those cast for the Deputy Calvinhac, who sits with the Socialist group, but whose candidacy has not a very clear Socialist character, we obtain a total of 893,720 Socialist votes.

In 1898 the Socialist party cast 790,000 votes; there is then an evident increase, though less than what we might have hoped.

As to the number of candidates elected, we had thirty-nine in the old legislature; in the new we have forty-four (omitting Grousset and Millerand in both cases). Of those elected, fourteen belong to the group of the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire" and thirty-two to the "Parliamentary Socialist Group," which includes twenty-five elected by the "Parti Socialiste Français," four elected by the "Federation des Bouches du Rhone," and three doubtful Socialists (Grousset, Millerand and Calvinhac).

The number of Deputies does not correspond to the real Socialist strength of each department, in view of the alliances which were concluded, if party discipline on the second ballot had been observed by the bourgeois republicans. These, as a matter of fact, appealed to the Socialists to assure their victory over their reactionary competitors, when the Socialists came out in the third

place on the ballot, and in general the Socialists always vote at the second ballot for the bourgeois radical republicans against the pure reactionaries. On the contrary, in many cases, the bourgeois radicals, even when they call themselves "radical Socialists," prefer rather to see a reactionary win than a Socialist, and it is under these conditions that we lost several seats.

Moreover, by reason of the chances of the ballot and the defective system of election by arrondissements, the elections result in surprising inequalities. Thus in the department of the North the "Unité Socialiste Revolutionnaire," which polled 62,261 votes, had but a single Deputy, Delory, elected at Lille, where he has already been Mayor of the city for six years; on the contrary, the "Federation de la Cote d'Or," belonging to the "Parti Socialiste Francais," which polled 11,600 votes, succeeded in electing two Deputies, Bouhey-Alex and Camuzet.

On the whole, the Socialists may regard with confidence the political situation in France and the future reserved for them. In the Parliament, which has just held its first session, in which the groups of the Left have already obtained a complete victory by electing their candidate, the radical Leon Bourgeois, to the presidency, our party will be able to play an important and sometimes even a decisive part. It includes in its ranks some of the most eminent orators and politicians of France. At the side of Vaillant, Marcel Sembat, Rouanet and Poulain, who have been re-elected, come Jaures, de Pressense, A. Briand, Delory and Constant. This will permit our party to assert itself impressively on all important questions of national and international policy.

This parliamentary action is but a part, and not the most important part, of Socialist activity. Something even more important than success at the polls is the progress of Socialist consciousness in the masses, and successes at the polls are in themselves of interest only so far as they permit us to judge of the increase of this Socialist consciousness. Moreover, the development of the economic institutions of the proletariat, the labor unions and co-operatives are also essential. But it is very evident that with the success of the party on the political field, its success on the economic field will be multiplied.

To permit our ideas to pursue their victorious march it is essential in France, as everywhere, that our friends resolutely put aside the grave danger of state socialism. I see by reading the Appeal to Reason that a certain number of our American comrades are also dominated by this deplorable state Utopianism, and that they are confusing public ownership, or "Statization" of certain monopolies with the socialization of all the means of production by the organized proletariat, taking into its hands production and exchange. Our ministerialists are also the dupes of this governmental illusion. I have shown in this article what

harm "ministerialism" has done to French socialism. Only in proportion as all Socialists renounce such dangerous illusions will it be possible for our party to regain its unity. That depends on men like Jaures and on their willingness to have done with the deplorable opportunist tactics, for in spite of all there is no doubt that among all true Socialists there exist plenty of points of contact. Our victorious march depends on our union.

Jean Longuet (translated by Charles H. Kerr).

Paris, June 7, 1902.

Immediate Demands.

THE Socialists primarily concern themselves with analyzing the capitalist system, pointing out its defects and advocating the replacing of the capitalist system by the collective ownership and democratic administration of the means of production and distribution.

The success of the Socialist movement and the rapidity of its progress will depend very largely upon the method of education and the political tactics of the Socialist party. Mere economic development in itself cannot bring the co-operative commonwealth.

In demanding measures for immediate improvement from the dominant capitalist parties, we in no way submerge the Socialist movement, nor do we waver from the belief in a class conflict. Immediate demands are perfectly consistent with the recognized fact that the capitalist class is in full control of the political state and uses its influence and power, including police, courts and militia to maintain its position of advantage and the permanency of its class.

The capitalist system, however, is not a consistent, methodical and perfectly regulated device. It is filled with contradictions, and the economic contradictions of capitalism, Socialists recognize very well and frequently comment thereon, and we find examples in the tendency of capitalism to obliterate competition on one hand, and the endeavor theoretically and practically to maintain competition on the other, such as the trusts, which negative competition, and against this condition pass laws which make it a penalty to form an agreement in restraint of trade.

The political program of the Socialists is essentially constructive. It must deal with the capitalist system as it is, and take advantage of every possible opportunity to assist in the transition from the private to the public ownership of capital. There is no place in the political movement for the midnight revolution, and cataclysmic transformation.

Among the many contradictory phrases in the political and the economic life of capitalism, there will many be found which have a tendency to strengthen and benefit the working class without giving any corresponding advantage to the capitalist class. All measures which have a tendency to raise the standard of life of the working class through shorter hours, superior educational facilities and opportunities, through higher wages and a better opportunity to organize trade unions, help and assist the Socialist movement because it strengthens those who are taking part therein and compose the bulk of its membership.

The so-called revolutionary Socialists of Chicago went so far (some of them) as to oppose a general referendum on the proposition as to whether the citizens of Chicago should have the privilege of voting on the three questions, to-wit: Municipalizing electric lights, gas and street railways, and when submitted to a vote, some voted against it.

The difference between those believing that we should advocate immediate measures together with our ultimate aim, and those opposed to everything except our ultimate aim, can be illustrated by their points of disagreement in regard to trade unions. The latter, or "clear cuts," advocated trade unions because it is a class movement and educational. Its economic value he deprecates because it "makes pets" and favorites of some workingmen, believing that to raise the life standard of workingmen breeds contentment and thereby retards the "revolution." The former, or so-called "opportunists," believes in the trade union movement not only because of its class character and educational value, but because as an economic weapon it maintains for the workingmen a higher standard of existence than that which they would enjoy if they were completely disorganized.

Socialism does not advance necessarily in response to or because of great industrial distress. These crises may point out the fact that something is wrong, but the suggestion of the remedy and the cure for these ills is quite a different problem. Socialism has made more advance in the last two years in Chicago, than it did in the year 1893, when the stone floor of the City Hall was covered with the restless, homeless, discontented men and thousands of unemployed paraded the streets. Of course, it is true that the very best paid workingmen may be a little slow in picking up Socialism, which is due to the fact that their condition economically is superior to the other workmen in different lines, for by comparison they have nothing to complain about; but all this is no reason why we should oppose or ignore municipal ownership and municipal coal and wood yards and ice houses, etc., which would benefit the people to at least some extent, and the working class more than any others, because there are more workingmen than parasites.

In our recent convention, one "Revolutionist" was applauded when he announced his opposition to municipal ownership because it would improve the condition of the workingmen in those industries. He wanted to improve the condition of all workingmen altogether and simultaneously; the improvement of a part of them at a time to him was to make the favored "pets." I mention this not to reply, that would be stultifying, but because a majority of the convention supported his position, just as though the working class was on an elevator and by pulling the "clear

cut, uncompromising rope," they could all go up evenly together.

One objection to demands made is that capitalists would not operate public utilities as well nor from the same standpoint as Socialists. This contains but a partial truth. Where a city has one or two industries which do not contribute to the health and welfare of its citizens through political corruption and private contracts, such enterprises may be manipulated in the interest of private contractors, etc.

The more important and far-reaching the industries operated by the people, whether a water works or a fire department, the greater will be the interest manifested by the people in public affairs, and the better service will be rendered to the public. And furthermore, every assumption by the state in industries has a tendency to turn the mind of the people from the operating of industries to serve private ends to the operating of industries to serve the public good. The motive of the two enterprises is entirely different. The former is capitalistic, the latter Socialist. The former to make money, the latter for utility, and the more extensive municipal or state ownership becomes the greater social consciousness springs up from the people. It is suggested that the Democratic and Republican party will grant and make these concessions which form a part of the Socialist program. That should not make it any less our duty to demand them and agitate for them. If we are to abandon our objects because a capitalist party prints in its platform, and declares for identically the same thing, then our existence as a political factor is precarious indeed, and it would be equally illogical to take the position opposing a public measure for the reason that capitalists favor it. Upon that theory, we would discharge the fire department and cashier the health officers, and abandon the life-saving service.

It is again urged that demands may be well enough, but they would result in emphasizing palliatives, rather than the fundamental principles of the party. I do not think that emphasis possible to the extent of endangering the party. At the recent municipal elections at Erie, Pa., and Milwaukee, Wis., both of which had progressive programs, there was a range of debate and agitation from the most inconsequential palliative to the entire abolition of the wage system, and in both campaigns it was noticeable that while they opened with discussions of minor points it soon shifted to the fundamental differences between capitalism and the Socialists. These two circumstances do not prove the futility of these demands, but emphasize their political value. Again, it is suggested that in Europe, where considerable nationalization exists, the working class is no better off than here. In the first place, in Europe the railroads are used to serve and support an

extensive military regime. The political structure of the United States is quite different from that of European countries, and has no extensive military system to serve. Here there is a certain state autonomy, and in many states comparative municipal autonomy prevails.

The population of Chicago is nearly as large as that of Massachusetts, and greater than the combined population of Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Rhode Island. The municipal utilities employ thousands, and there is no force in the argument that municipalizing will build or strengthen a political machine. The republican and democratic politicians control far more offices, more positions and employes who are serving as laborers for the street car and gas companies, and over these employes exercise a much greater influence, considering their number, than they do over the actual city employes. These large private corporations in the cities do not hesitate to corrupt the judiciary, to defeat a working man's damage suit, steal a highway, and then prohibit their own employes from organizing into trade unions. Under city ownership these evils would be minimized, and while it might be slight, the benefits at least warrant a ten word demand in a Socialist platform.

To say that we must oppose these reforms until the Socialist party has complete control of the city, state and nation, is to become impractical, and leave no program for a possible elected candidate, and the conceit of it will breed sterility, and make DeLeon the true Messiah.

As a matter of fact, the capitalists are not willing to grant these reforms. A great public sentiment has been aroused and a pressure brought to bear which they realize cannot long be resisted. For franchises they appeal to the courts, resort to bribery, reach the press, and contribute to the pulpit. They give ground reluctantly, and we should take our position against them. For every private enterprise wrung from capitalists and turned over to the public, no matter how imperfect its shape may be, is a weakening of the opposition and reduces the power of their resistance to Socialism.

The Manifesto has demands, the Social Democracy of Germany has demands, the same is true of Great Britain, Belgium and Sweden, and all other European countries, and in those countries they exploit every public question and capitalist contentions to make known the object and purpose of Socialism. Opportunities in this country now are afforded which are simply marvelous, claiming the public attention and not infrequently disturbing the entire industrial system. Strikes, riots, public crimes, child labor, the invasion of the public schools by cutting off their means of support, and a thousand and one different popular means of

securing the attention of the people. There is no ground for the conservative timidity or the fetish worshiping bigotry which has heretofore prevailed in the Socialist parties of this country. Its integrity can be maintained, its service to the people enhanced, and its beneficial effect to the working class increased, by availing ourselves of the opportunities of each succeeding day.

Seymour Stedman

Economic Development and Socialist Tactics.

THE economic development of Europe is so far behind that of America that the problem that is being discussed by Ferri and Kautsky has a very different aspect here in the United States, although at first glance one might think that the question of the insertion of immediate demands in our platform was identical.

We do not insert immediate demands in our platform because we think that we will ever get them or think that getting them we will gain any prestige.

Not at all. We American Socialists recognize that while immediate demands are wanted by a large class of the middle class of people, and that to please them it is policy to insert them in our platform, yet we see that the economic revolution has advanced so far in this country that it is practically impossible to conceive of any considerable part of such demands ever being granted without there coming with it the whole Socialist program.

In Europe it is quite different. All the demands that form a part of our program could be granted by any European government, and it would have little or no immediate economic or political effect toward bringing on a social revolution.

The difference between America and Europe on this question is the difference between a dam that is well constructed holding up a small body of water and a dam that is old and ready to break holding back a great flood that is threatening at any moment to rise and sweep over the dam and carry the whole structure away. In such a case as the latter it is obvious that any weakening the strength of the dam will cause the already over-burdened structure to immediately give way.

I do not think it possible for this country to nationalize the railways without precipitating a social revolution. I have gone over this ground for this theory so often for the last twelve years that it is almost superfluous to state my reasons again. Shortly my argument is that in the United States the capitalization of the railways is greater than the capitalization of the manufacturing interests. Hence if we nationalize the railways we would put into the hands of the present railway owners the economic power to expropriate the manufacturing capitalists. This they would be sure to do. Just as sure to do it as would a pike in a carp pond be sure to gobble the carp. The big capitalist lives only for the purpose of eating up smaller capitalists.

Now the expropriation of the manufacturing capitalists by the former railway capitalists would materially create a revolu-

tion right then and there. I do not mean that it would from its economic effect, but from its political and its psychological effect. Then the nationalization of the railways would also carry with it the nationalization of the steel and iron interests, the coal mines, the locomotive works, the car works, and such a lot of collateral and dependent industries that it would mean such a change of ownership that I can see no possibility of looking at nationalization of our railways except as a revolutionary measure.

I dwell upon the nationalization of the railways, as this is the main plank of the middle class people, and of the Fabians.

Practically the only industrial reform, from a national standpoint, that the middle class demand is that of nationalization of the railways. It is true some call for nationalization of the trusts, but the call is not strong.

But to nationalize even the smallest trust would be even a surer cause for a social revolution than would the nationalization of the railways. Or, rather, I had better put it to get the people in the mood to nationalize the first trust would mean that you had gotten them in the mood to nationalize all trusts. The first success would so intoxicate them that they would never stop until they had swallowed the whole trust ocean.

Then again, the only thing that is going to move the people to any action upon domestic affairs is the great unemployed problem that must appear in our next industrial crisis, now ready to appear. This is going to be of such a critical character and of such an intense nature that the nation will be forced to take the most heroic measures to meet the situation. Thousands of smaller capitalists will go down in the crash, and there will be millions of unemployed workingmen. I don't know which will make the most noise, the capitalists over the loss of their money or the workingmen over the loss of their food. Anyway it will be a pretty chorus. The house of Morgan & Co. will probably go under, and that will be the signal of the social revolution. People will know that when the Colossus Morgan falls that then is the end of modern society.

Morgan has been forced by the danger of over-production to finance and organize all the great trusts with which he has been the head and front, and he and his brother bankers are carrying millions upon millions of the stocks of these mighty corporations which they have been unable to unload upon the public. And a very good reason, too. The public have no money to buy. Morgan & Co. have all the means of production in their hands, and where can the public get any money to buy the stocks? However, there are many bankers and capitalists on the outside of the Morgan combinations in times of distress if these people refuse to carry the Morgan stocks, then Morgan must go to the wall.

Viewing the industrial and financial situation in this way, I

have no fears of the proletariat ever being led off by any spurious state socialism in the shape of public ownership, etc. I think we are so impregnable by our economic maturity that nothing can possibly deflect us from going straight into revolutionary socialism the moment we make a move. I would never fear public ownership because of its being carried into effect. Not at all. I do not see how it can be possibly carried into effect without landing us into socialism. I therefore welcome all sentiment in favor of public ownership, as I think it gets men's minds turned in the right direction.

I favor the retention of amelioratory demands in our platform because I feel that we are too far advanced economically for any one of them to be put into effect without really starting the social revolution, and I think that having the demands in our platform attracts a good many half-baked people to us that we might as well have with us as not.

The aim of our party should be to get as many as possible in sympathy with us without surrendering in any way our revolutionary ideal.

In my magazine I give from time to time accounts of the great progress that New Zealand has made in public ownership, and the many benefits that have flowed therefrom. I do not do this because I think or wish the United States to follow in her footsteps. She could not do so. Nor do I mention New Zealand as an example of how we can get into socialism step by step.

New Zealand, however, does to convey to a great many unimaginative people a lesson as to what the state can do in the way of public ownership. There are many people that would never believe that the United States could ever run her railroads unless we had a Vanderbilt to own them. For such people the lesson of New Zealand is valuable.

When I was in England I often spoke of myself as a revolutionary Fabian. Meaning that I thought the Fabians did a great deal of good in directing the attention of the public to the possibilities of public ownership, and that the knowledge they disseminated upon that subject should weaken the objections that many made as to the impossibility of socialism.

I never could understand why it was that the Fabians, with one or two exceptions, were so entirely out with me upon my Marxian revolutionary catastrophic economies, when all the industrial events so bore out such a theory. In fact, their own facts bore against their own theories.

However, I don't know that anyone is in quite my position of looking for a socialist revolution in a short number of years, owing to the completion of the machinery of production being finished and hence causing a great unemployed problem, and yet at the same time holding that it is good politics for the Socialists

to always favor the step at a time program, although knowing such a program is an impossibility.

I admit the inconsistency of such a policy, but we must take men as they are and not as we would have them. This is the manifesto I ran upon in my candidature for the Canadian Parliament last May. My constituency embraced many farmers, and unless I had a "railway" plank I could never have had many farmer voters.

TO THE ELECTORS OF WEST ELGIN.

As the nominee of the Socialist party for Parliament, it is incumbent upon me to give an outline of my principles in order that you may determine if I am worthy of your suffrages.

I am in favor of the Co-operative System of Industry as opposed to the Competitive System. As the result of our competitive system the rewards of labor, instead of flowing to those that labor, flow to the idle possessors of wealth. Whatever may have been the virtues of competition in the past, when we were all on a practically substantial equality of wealth, it has become in the present day of millionaires and paupers simply a means of robbing labor for the benefit of those who hold the wealth of the country.

Competition forces us to sell our goods at the price named by our competitor. If we are selling our labor power we must sell it not at the price we know it is actually worth, but at the price our competitor offers HIS labor power for in the open market. And who is "our competitor?" He is the unemployed man who must sell his labor at once or go hungry. There are always plenty of such men about, and competition from such keeps down the price of labor, i. e., wages, to the mere existence point.

No matter how much labor may increase in productivity, the laborer can get no increased price for it, because competition will always force him to sell it at the same price as before.

Just as the laborer is forced to sell his commodity—labor—at the lowest competitive price, so are the merchants, the manufacturers and the farmers also obliged to sell their commodities at the lowest competitive price. The only man who can get a price above cost for his commodity is the man who can protect himself from competition by the shield of monopoly. The workman, by means of his trades union, prevents wages going down to the very lowest notch; and likewise the capitalist, by virtue of the ownership of land or such machinery as cannot well be duplicated, or by aid of a combination, can protect the prices of his goods from falling below cost.

Monopoly is the key to money getting, but monopoly is not open to all.

The trade union is, at best, but a very indifferent protection

against starvation wages, and in slack times is no protection at all against non-employment.

A monopoly for the farmers and the smaller capitalist is out of the question. There are too many of them to make any effective combination. It is easy enough for two or three railroads to combine, but for two or three million farmers to agree to stop growing crops and hold for a common price is manifestly an impossibility. The farmer must sell his goods in competition with the world and face millions of competitors. If he has any advantage in the ownership of exceptionally good land he is lucky if the railroad company does not find it out and put up their rates to a point that will skim off all the profits that are due to such land value. The farmer is really but little, if any, better off than the workingman, inasmuch as he must always sell his product on a competitive market and whatever advantage he should have by virtue of the ownership of his land is usually lost owing to the high price he must pay to the various combinations controlling the railways, and to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, etc., and other goods he must buy.

The Dominion of Canada should own the railways and furnish transportation at cost, payment for the roads being made by bonds, the interest being met by the profits from the freight charges.

The merchants are also suffering from severe competition among themselves, and are now threatened with a new danger in the growth of the huge department stores which are gradually absorbing all the retail trading.

Labor saving machinery operated by steam and electricity has enormously augmented the productivity of labor. The workingman has participated but little in this increased product. Nor have the smaller capitalists and farmers participated to any degree. Nearly the whole of the increase has gone to the monopolists.

The result of our competitive system is that the many produce and the few get. Those that "get" are those that own the great monopolies and the railways.

I would substitute public ownership for private ownership of these great monopolies, to the end that the many might participate in the advantages now enjoyed by the few.

Let the people own the monopolies and let the products of labor be distributed upon the co-operative plan, instead of the competitive plan. We have solved the problem of production; our only problem of to-day is that of distribution.

Canada is the richest country under the sun. She could furnish a living to ten times her present population and still have plenty of room for as many more again. However, notwithstanding Canada's riches, very few of her people are secure against

an old age of poverty nor indeed are they sure of a decent living from month to month.

I would end all such uncertainty. We here in Canada can all
n profusion with only three
anize our industrial system
operation.

most interested in having
aid the farmers, to unite at
pledged to carry out the

m.

m. 124.7 - 125.1 Chlorine

The Two Tendencies.

Berlin, February 16, 1902.

DEAR COMRADE FERRI: It gives me the greatest pleasure to receive the news that you intend to publish a review, which will certainly be very useful to our cause, and of importance not only for Italy but for international socialism.

Everywhere in our party the same divergence manifests itself: in Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Russia and Belgium. There is not, fundamentally, any antagonism between reform and revolution, for the revolutionists also desire reforms. Neither is there an antagonism between theoretical and practical Socialists, for each are found on both sides. It is therefore ridiculous presumption for some to claim the distinction of "critics of socialism," in opposition to us, who are to be regarded as "bigots of dogmas and phrases, lacking critical judgment."

Instead, the divergence, which exists throughout international socialism, has for its basis the different position of the two tendencies in relation to the middle class.

This is the nucleus of the question which causes all the differences. Is the antagonism between the middle class and the proletariat so great as to prevent the proletariat from allying itself with certain factions of the middle class against other groups of the middle class? Or are there within the middle class enmities greater than the hostility which exists between the middle class and the working class, so that in some circumstances it is possible and even necessary to establish by the alliance of the working class with certain factions of the middle class a great reform party or a new party of such strength and stability as to be able to share in the government?

Is this alliance of the proletariat with parties of the middle class for the purpose of forming a government party, a necessary stage in the march of the proletariat to the conquest of political power?

Or is it an occasional act made possible or even necessary by exceptional contingencies, rather than simply a normal stage of the evolution through which the party in all countries should pass?

This is the question which is the basis of our dissensions. But unfortunately it is not usually stated so precisely; therefore it is obscured by secondary questions which are principally of a theoretical nature. And this is true, especially in countries where there is a deep gulf between the Socialist and the other parties

excluding presumptively every practical application of the new method; in such cases the antagonism is reduced to small and trivial contentions which cause bitterness instead of obtaining a solution.

On the other hand, the divergence manifests itself with clear and precise outlines only in countries where it can have a practical influence on the life of the party; that is, where there is a government which has good sense enough to recognize the great strength of socialism and enough craft and courage to try to subdue it—by yoking it to the chariot of the government. This was the case in France, where the new tactics have had the opportunity to show of what use they really are. "Ye shall know them by their fruits," says the Bible, and we can judge the new tactics also by their fruits.

In Italy the new tactics have not been put on trial as in France. However, the recent Parliamentary situation has prepared a soil favorable to their development. More than elsewhere, except in France, the divergence within the party finds in Italy the possibility of leaving purely theoretical grounds to assume a concrete form. After the evolution of French socialism, that of Italy will be in the near future very instructive for the international proletariat.

Therefore I consider the new review "Il Socialismo" (Socialism) of great importance and feel honored in defining and elucidating, in its columns, the internal controversies of the party; so much the more, as it is preferable that the discussion should be published in reviews, rather than take up too much space in periodicals devoted to propaganda. It is indeed true that this is possible only in a case where the dissension does not exceed certain limits, a matter which depends on circumstances more than on the good will of persons.

The divergence exists; to be silent about it or to conceal it, is to increase the malady and delay its cure.

But we heartily wish that the present controversy could be ended without disturbing the unity and strong concord of the party. Being caused by a transitory situation, the present antagonism in the party can and ought to pass away. We wish that the Socialist parties of other countries could be saved from the bitter experiences of the ministerialism of the Socialists of France, and that the class struggle could everywhere animate the united forces of the proletariat and thus enable them to resist the disintegrating effects of ministerialism.

May your review co-operate strongly in such a movement! I wish it long life and prosperity! Cordially yours,

Karl Kautsky.

Prof. Ferri gives the following comments:—

Kautsky made the motion relating to the Millerand question which was passed by the International Socialist Congress of 1900 in Paris, and he now reaffirms the existence of two tendencies in the Socialist party. This does not destroy the essential unity of the party, which, under the stress of all circumstances, will always prevail, as we see in anti-ministerialism the concord of all Socialists.

To deny the existence of those two tendencies, however, means to yield to an apprehension or to an illusion. There is the disinterested and very respectable apprehension that the admitting of a divergence of views and judgments will injure the unity of the party and sharpen personal dissensions. The prevailing illusion shows itself when—as the result of discussions—the reformers put wine in their water or the revolutionists put water in their wine, it is not taken into account that the average resulting from a minor divergence or from an agreement is precisely the effect of these discussions on the two tendencies. While if these discussions were not held, each of the two divisions might easily make mistakes by going to extremes and exaggerating its own tendency.

The recent polemics on the function of the Socialist party in strikes (to which we shall soon give our attention) is an eloquent example of this.

As for our review, we intend to co-operate in the movement as Kautsky desires, not only by means of polemics (in which we will always preserve cordiality of expression in order to resist the temptation of using irritating words, and avoid rancour, which is so much the more bitter among brothers), but especially by practical observations on the life of our party in different countries, and by the calm and objective study of social facts, keeping the socialist ideal constantly in view, without sacrificing it or obscuring it for the sake of small and temporary gains.

(From Prof. Enrico Ferri's fortnightly review, "Il Socialismo," No. 1, February 25.)

Translated by Agnes Wakefield.

HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(Concluded.)

IV. The Climax of Capitalism.

The last epoch to be discussed in our historical sketch coincides approximately with the last decade of the past century. During this period we see events of paramount significance stepping on one another's heels, so to say. Only two of these, however, are of a purely economic nature and exert their influence to the extent of attracting public attention in the beginning of the nineties.

The first and most important of these factors owes its existence to a fact, unknown before 1894, which may be expressed in this general way: The supply of free land is now exhausted. To state it more accurately, only an insignificant remnant of such government land as may be cultivated without the help of gigantic irrigation works is still available. But the farmer class as a whole does not favor irrigation, because the resulting extension of the area of cultivation would cause a falling of the grain prices. With the exception of the already considerably reduced Indian reservations, only arid desert land is now obtainable for a song. The social safety valve, which such men as Edward Atkinson, Professor Sumner and other economist lackeys of the bourgeoisie hoped would save this country forever from a revolutionary explosion, is now closed, and the foundation removed for the well-known contention of the ex-rebel of 1848, Carl Schurz: "There are many social questions in America, but there is no social question."

About this time the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Agriculture reports that practically one-third of the 63,000,000 acres of farm land in the North Atlantic States, from Maine to Pennsylvania, is lying fallow, although located in close proximity to the best markets and lines of transportation, and that the formerly cultivated, but now abandoned, farm land in all the Atlantic States, from Maine to Florida, covers not less than 58 out of a total of about 100 million acres. The deserted farms, many of them with well-preserved houses and barns, speak a mute and yet eloquent language. They are especially numerous in the northeastern part of New York and in the New England States. Their former owners had moved west, in order to exhaust the virgin soil by superficial cultivation, since the eastern soil would not yield any more without intensive cultivation, such as liberal application of fertilizers, etc. But now the land west of the Mississippi, which is accessible without the outlay of capital, is also

exhausted. Horace Greeley's ideological palliative, "Go West, young man," is played out.

The second of the economic factors now exerting its influence is a techno-chemical invention. It was, and still is, of vital importance to the cotton industry of the South, and to the production of cotton goods in the North and other places, being in the nature of a supplement to the invention of the cotton gin. We speak of the invention and application of the process for the commercial exploitation of cotton seed, its utilization for the production of such valuable by-products as oil of different qualities (the finer grades used as salad oil), cake, meal, hulls and linters, with but two per cent of waste. In chapter I. of this sketch we saw that the seeds of the cotton plant drove the planter almost to distraction, because they adhered to the fiber and were very difficult to remove, until the cotton gin came along and removed the difficulty. And now—what a wonderful change in the development of the facts and their irresistible consequences—this once accursed cotton seed becomes a new source of profit. In the year 1899-1900, the planters received the average sum of \$11.55 per ton of cotton seed delivered to the oil mills, yielding them a surplus of \$28,632,616 for a total of 2,479,386 tons. Through the process of manufacturing these seeds acquired a total value of \$42,411,835. Considering that only 53.1 per cent of the cotton seed were delivered to the mills, we find that the potential and attainable value of this seed and its products could have been double the aforesaid amount. The cost of cotton production was correspondingly lowered by the surplus yield of the by-products, and it was, perhaps, this fact which made the demand of the southern ruling class for a cheapening of oversea transportation by means of a back freight less urgent and passionate.

The last named economic factor reacted on the political development of a large portion of the southern population, for now the interests of the small planters were very similar to those of the northern wheat growers. Both, planters and wheat growers, have no interest in a protective tariff, and very little in free trade. But the leaden weight of overproduction is crushing both of them, depressing the price of their products, sometimes below the level of the cost of production. On the wheat and corn fields of the North the balance is then always restored by a restriction of the area of cultivation. But in the South the area cultivated by the small farmer is already so minimal that no further restriction is possible. The outcome of the Civil War had driven most of the southern cotton barons into bankruptcy, and led to a parceling of their large estates into small farms. The majority of these southern small farmers have since been reduced from the position of independent owners to that of renters. The same process takes place in the North. In both cases the low level of

the prices, and nothing but that, uses the mortgage as the lever by which the farm owner is transformed into a farm renter. The great increase in the number of rented farms was one of the most important facts of the preceding decade, and it has steadily continued its course during the last ten years. This state of things is concealed by the statistics, as long as the farm owners are not classified separately from the farm renters. The concentration becomes only slightly manifest from the number of small farms, but all the more from the figures of the property relations.

We see, then, that the first of the two economic factors mentioned obstructs the tide of the westward emigration of proletarian and penurious workingmen and turns it backward by limiting and finally removing all prospects of successful colonization, while the second intensifies the precarious condition of the small farmers in the North and South and thus makes the agrarian question in this country more acute.

Apart from the above named factors, this period does not produce any new forces on the field of economic history, but all the factors created by former periods now work with a greatly intensified power. Capitalism is moving with giant strides and rushing forward and upward to the climax of its career. Our manufacturing industry and its enormously developed productive capacity have now reached the point where America's share in the proceeds of the world market does no longer yield a sufficient rate of interest on the investment. The fatherland of the American capitalist, that is, the market for his products, must become greater. That is the logic of capitalist patriotism, and its current expression is "expansion." And that is what our most prominent patriots are now yearning to obtain. But there is no longer any outlet for American products in the countries immediately adjoining the United States in the North and South. Canada and Mexico offer no more economic opportunities and the external political constellations do not vouchsafe a war of conquest in those directions. Those two countries, like almost all other countries on the American continent, are themselves advanced in the capitalist development, and the conquest of their markets would be a game not worth the candle. Nothing is left, therefore, but the acquisition, that is, the conquest by force of arms, of islands that shall serve as colonies and remain so. Colonial expansion becomes a fact, resumption of the primitive method of capitalist accumulation, with all its concomitant atrocities on the part of the Christian representatives of "American civilization." The traditions of the fathers of the republic, the Declaration of Independence, and all the venerable principles with which a regular cult had been driven only a short while ago, all this is now considered as youthful aberration by our ruling class and its politicians, and thrown into the plunder room. Militarism on

the water is already established, militarism ashore is coming, our profit mongers are now preparing for new adventures on the highway of world politics.

Under such impulses as these our government, dancing in obedience to strings pulled by a clique of great capitalists, precipitated the war with Spain. Not only was that war most frivolous and criminally provoked, under the cloak of the lying pretense "setting Cuba free," but a flagrant fraud was also committed against Congress and the people of the United States by suppressing the official declaration of Spain, the publication of which would doubtless have averted the war. For this dastardly act the name of the arch-hypocrite McKinley, on whom the assassin an idiot bestowed the halo of a saint, will be nailed to the pages of coming centuries. The outcome of this war was nothing but the "relieving" impulse for the transformation of American capitalism into its highest and last form, Imperialism. It cannot go back any more, and a chasm is yawning in front of it.

Here ends our investigation of American history, from the year of the Declaration of Independence and the beginning of the American Revolution down to these days, when that first proclamation of the Fathers of the Republic was suppressed by American authorities in the Philippine Islands. A fugitive from the shows us that the Washington government is still busy crushing the resistance of the Filipino fighters for independence, in imitation of the London government, which is attempting to crush the independent Boers in South Africa.

From 1776 to 1900-02 is a century and a quarter. How short, how remarkably short is this term when compared with five centuries which capitalism required for its development in England and in all other European countries, without reaching the same climax as in America. "Pride leads to downfall," a German proverb. Being prouder than any other, should American capitalism meet its doom first of all?

Coming Party Politics.

In the preceding chapter we have alluded to one of the principal results of the economic history of the United States—the world-stirring war with Spain. That all other important political events of this period can also be traced to economic cause hardly require a detailed explanation after all we have said in this historic sketch. These events are still too fresh in our memory and their economic foundation is too clearly apparent. In any way, the social development of our time renders the phenomena and conditions resulting from it more and more transparent, thus it becomes even easier for all men of average intelligence to understand the working of its "underground" machinery, to see, to say, and to recognize its material and economic forces.

The victories of the great capitalist republican party in the elections of 1896 and 1900 are a case in point. The years of the crisis of 1893-95 were a time of severe suffering for our proletariat, and the disaster was put down to the account of the silver humbug of the democratic politician, not without some reason. Of course, the lack of class consciousness, and the general political immaturity, of the American workingmen, was still considerable enough in 1896 and 1900 to make a great mass of them prone to vote for Wm. J. Bryan and a reduction of the exchange value of their wages, out of regard for their "farming brethren." But the capitalists used all their political influence to march their "hands" as voting cattle to the ballot box. Whenever voters succumb to such a political intimidation, it may be easily explained by their economic dependence. Marx has already said in the constitution of the International Workingmen's Association that "the economic dependence of the workingman on the monopoly of the tools of production and means of existence is the basis of servitude in every form, of social misery, intellectual degradation, and political dependence."

And what happened to the specifically agrarian party, the "People's Party?" It disappeared entirely from the scene. A few years of prosperity were sufficient to withdraw the ground from under its feet.

The question of a protective tariff, or free trade, or an approach to the latter, still plays an important part in the history of this country and has its source directly in the conflict of material interests which leads to political divergence. The time when our industrials will feel the protective tariff as an impediment to further development in production and especially as an obstacle to export is not yet in sight. Its coming is delayed in the United States by the fact that this country produces its own surplus of cheap foodstuffs for export, and that at the same time the cost of labor is cheaper here than anywhere else on account of the incomparably more advanced technical development. Moreover, the raw products and accessories needed in manufacture are for the greater part obtained either in our own country or recently in our colonial "possessions." One might be induced to say that the existence of the republican party is safeguarded by these conditions as long as capitalism itself, of which it is the typical political representative, will last.

Not so the democratic party. It will no longer have any stable ground under its feet, no longer any material fundament, as soon as it will drop the "silver issue," which it will probably do soon, and when it can no longer use the "tariff issue" as a pretext, which will become a fact at no remote date. The latter issue will fall so much sooner, as the South is now in process of industrial development. We have already pointed out the ex-

ploitation of the by-products of cotton as one of the factors in this new phase. A still more effective reason is the increase of cotton spinning and weaving in the South, which will promptly change the traditional hankering of the Southerners for free trade into the opposite. And the democratic party stands and falls with the great political phalanx, which it had so long in its "solid South." Therefore it must fall, and will begin to show signs of disintegration in the near future.

The consolidation of the two capitalist parties into one will become a fact, sooner or later. And if anything is able to give rise to a strong political labor movement, it will be such a combination of the parasitic classes. A unified political organization of the exploiting classes will necessitate a uniform political organization of the working class, and this will be the Socialist party. And when those ten thousands of exploiters are confronted by the political class consciousness of the millions of workers, then the battle will be won. A beginning, however small, of the political organization of the working class has already been made. As such we may regard the total Socialist vote polled in 1900: 128,000 (S. L. P. 33,450, and 94,552 for the S. D. P., which had then only been organized for two years). At last the economic development begins to hammer a little class consciousness into the thick skulls of the American workingmen and opens their understanding for the significance of such drastic and bloody experiences as those of Homestead, Idaho, the railway strike of 1894, Hazleton, of the despotic injunctions issued by the judicial lackeys of capitalism, and of their nihilism concerning any effective labor legislation.

* * *

My work is done. It may be marred by some shortcomings, it may lack completeness, but it should be regarded simply as a sketch. Physical suffering, which the writer was undergoing during his task, may also have affected the literary form. It may also serve as a further excuse that the writer did not find his subject ready at hand and prepared by others. He had not only to describe, but also to venture as an explorer into still very unknown, though much discussed, fields. As a purely theoretical subject, the materialist conception of history, originated by Karl Marx, and further developed by Engels, Kautsky and others, has certainly been discussed considerably, but only a few fragmentary attempts have been made at a practical application of this conception to the history of a given nation or country. To my knowledge, no one has hitherto approached the history of the United States from this standpoint. I had to point out the material connection between economics and politics in American history, and to solve this question within a limited space instead of writing a big volume. How far I have succeeded must be left to others

to decide. If this article will stimulate more capable and efficient talents to take up the subject and improve on my first attempt, I have not worked in vain.

J. L. Franz.

The War of Secession.

BY ERNEST CROSBY, AUTHOR OF "CAPTAIN JINKS, HERO."



AS I look back at the indelible bloody splash upon our history,—the four years' revel of hatred,—the crowded shambles of foiled Secession,—

I see that it was all a pitiable error.

That which we fought for,—the Union of haters by force,—was a wrong, misleading cause,—the warship of bigness,—the measure of greatness by size.

A single town true enough to abhor slaughter as well as slavery would have been better worth dying for than all that tempestuous domain.

From the seed then sown behold imperialism and militarism arise and a whole forest of stout, deep-rooted ills in whose shade we lead an unhealthy, stunted life to-day.

The incidental, unintended good,—the freedom of the slaves,—illusive, unsubstantial freedom at best,—freedom by law but not from the heart,—surely even this is but a doubtful balance in the scales.

Is the good that springs from evil ever a real good?

EDITORIAL

Socialism and the Trade Union Movement.

We have often pointed out, not only in these columns, but elsewhere, that the real revolutionary movement in America is to be found west of the Mississippi River. The social rebels who have been created in the East have been driven from their birth-place and are now to be found where the frontier was last located.

To be sure, economic conditions are ever producing new rebellions in the East, and now that the western avenue of escape from those conditions is closed, we may expect to see a rapid growth of intelligently organized discontent in the East. But until sufficient time shall have elapsed to produce a new race of social rebels the storm-center of discontent will be where the economic outcasts, the black-listed, the competition-crushed members of society are now located and that is in the West. Hence it is that the recent great movements in the west trade-unions do not come as a surprise to us.

The importance of the step taken at the Denver convention does not lie alone, or perhaps even chiefly in the fact that the delegates 120,000 laborers pledged their allegiance to Socialism. Such a declaration was but the most prominent and sensational among a host of signs that indicate the passing of the old and the coming of the new trade-unionism. The increasing number of Socialist articles in trade-union papers, the many instances of abortive "labor parties," the growth of "industrialism" in the unions, the election of prominent Socialists like Max Hayes to important trade-union positions, the readiness with which Socialist speakers are admitted to unions, and most important of all, the now numerous instances where large labor bodies support local Socialist tickets and participate in Socialist conventions—all these are signs that economic development and Socialist propaganda are beginning to teach the organized workers the lesson of a solidarity that does not dissolve into chaotic conflict at the most important point along the whole battle-line—the ballot-box.

The declaration of this great body of organized workers for independent political action will send a thrill of joy and encouragement through every worker for Socialism, and it will also send a shiver of apprehension, not to say terror, up and down the backs of those trade-union officials who are cringing and crawling before capitalist bosses and capitalist politicians, begging for one more chance to sell themselves and their class into industrial slavery.

But while we recognize the great good that was done at Denver,

cannot but wish that the better thing that was within their grasp had been accomplished.

When the delegates declared for Socialism, when they renounced allegiance to the old political parties, and set their faces toward the co-operative commonwealth, they were marching grandly forward. But when they decided to divide the forces of labor upon the industrial field, to establish rival unions, to set workmen against each other in the face of the employer, they were moving backwards.

It is true there was much provocation. It has been shown that while Gompers was writing articles in the American Federationist breathing the spirit of brotherly love, and was sending delegates ostensibly to secure harmony between the Western Labor Union and the American Federation of Labor, he was also sending out private letters in large quantities, most bitterly attacking that organization with its leaders. There may even be reason to believe that he was playing this apparently two-faced game with the expectation and intention of being found out, and hoped thereby to keep the two organizations apart. The entrance of a powerful, intelligently class-conscious body of workers such as make up the membership of the W. L. U. into the A. F. of L. might easily lead to a break-up of the continuous flirtation of Gompers with Hanna, Cleveland, Morgan & Co.

After granting all this the truth still remains that the place to fight these tendencies is inside and not outside the A. F. of L. This whole position has been so thoroughly fought out and so completely settled, both in theoretical discussion and in practical experience that we cannot but express our surprise at the eagerness with which many Socialists have welcomed this new movement.

When the Western Labor Union changed its name to the American Labor Union and declared its intention of invading the East to fight the American Federation of Labor, the Socialists who sanctioned that movement were helping to inaugurate another S. T. & L. A. It alters the case but little that the A. L. U. is a genuine labor union and not a mere paper appendix to a defunct political party. The principle remains the same.

The excuse may also be offered that initiative in the formation of the A. L. U. came from the industrial field and that therefore since the two unions came into existence independent of the Socialist Party the Socialists could do no less than show their sympathy with the union which adopted their principles.

But when all this sophistry is brushed aside we see at bottom the hard, indisputable fact that at a time when trade lines, race divisions, and national boundaries are all being wiped out in the internationalization of labor, we are about to see a fratricidal strife among the organized workers of America.

No one at all conversant with trade-union history or present conditions will be at all deceived by the statement that the A. L. U. proposes to work among the great body of unorganized who are eager for organization. Every new trade-union movement says the same thing. But the fact is that there is no such body clamoring for organization. The truth is that at the present moment, so far from expending all its energies in organizing new unions, the A. L. U. is seeking to secure the allegiance of old unions who are dissatisfied in any way with the A. F. of L. poli-

cies. These tactics can have but one result: Rival unions in the same field "scabbing" on each other while capitalists grow fat.

The more reactionary of the A. F. of L. officials are welcoming the fight. They know, if the founders of the A. L. U. do not, that an enemy is much less dangerous outside than inside their organization, and they see in the progressive tendencies of the A. L. U. their most deadly enemy. Already these leaders have forced the fight upon the brewery workers, and are demanding that those branches which are affiliated with the A. L. U. renounce their allegiance to that body. The brewery workers are strongly impregnated with Socialism and are antagonistic to the Gompers' ring and hence he would gladly see them outside.

The Gompers-Hanna combination will be quick to see their advantage. They will at once attack the Socialists who seek to work among the membership of the A. F. of L. as "union wreckers" and declare that the A. L. U. is simply the S. T. & L. A. of the Socialist Party. Those Socialists who cast in their lot with the A. L. U. will at once be debarred from further work in the much larger field of the A. F. of L. Can we afford to be put in this position? Is it fair to the many trade-unionists who are working within the old organizations for Socialism?

Of the ultimate result there is little doubt. In one way or another, sooner or later, the trade-union must come to accept the philosophy of Socialism. But because of this certainty of economic and intellectual evolution, we are in no way excused from considering the different roads by which that end may be reached. Indeed, since the goal is certain the method becomes of paramount importance.

The trade-union movement can be converted to Socialism by the gradual conversion of its members under the combined propaganda of economic development and Socialist teachings. When this stage is reached those officers who stand in the way of progress and seek to link proletarian fortunes to the capitalist chariot will be pushed one side in favor of those who more nearly incarnate the social forces of the time.

Had the A. L. U. sent their delegates to the next convention of the A. F. of L. at New Orleans, with instructions to add their efforts to those of Hayes, Barnes, Cowan and the ever-growing body of valiant workers for Socialism who have struggled so long and well within the unions, they would have struck the mightiest blow for Socialism that has fallen in these many years.

Another road, which perhaps leads to the same end, but which is already obstructed by the ill-smelling carcass of the S. T. & L. A. is that of independent Socialist unions. In the end there is a possibility that such a union will succeed in overthrowing the other unions, particularly if the older organizations continue their present reactionary tactics. But that victory will have been gained only at the terrible cost of several years of war between bodies of organized laborers, and the advance will have been made over the wrecks of ruined unions and disheartened workers. During all that time it means decreased power of resistance to exploitation.

Therefore it is that while we rejoice that the western workers have done so good a thing we cannot but believe there was a better thing within their grasp which they let slip, when they refused to add to

their declaration of the solidarity of the working-class in the political field a move toward strengthening their solidarity on the industrial field.

Since, however, this situation has now been forced upon us we must meet it. This break in the ranks of the workers in their industrial fight must be closed up as soon as possible. It is absolutely certain that sooner or later it will be closed up. The evolution of industry will compel union.

Again, the only question for Socialists is, How they can best hasten that union of forces. One thing is certain, and that is that the A. L. U. will never consent to link its fortunes with the A. F. of L. while the leaders of that organization are in such close connection with capitalism. For those Socialists who live in the West, the problem is simple. They now have an added reason for working for the success of organized labor.

For the eastern Socialist the question is a different one. The most effective way in which he can work to end this factional fight and to advance the interests of Socialism at the same time is to work to place the A. F. of L. upon the advanced ground now occupied by the A. L. U. Those who really wish to preserve the A. F. of L. as a fighting organization, who really have its best interests at heart, must bend all their energies toward the abolition of "Gomperism," and the education of their brother unionists in the principles of Socialism, so that the organization as a whole may be brought abreast of economic development.

Every effort should be made to see that the delegates to the convention at New Orleans are instructed to elect such men into the general offices of the A. F. of L. as have some comprehension of the progress of events.

If the A. F. of L. refuses to do this, if it still depends upon lobbying before capitalist parties for favors, if it continues to permit its officials to run for office on Democratic or Republican tickets, or to affiliate with Civic Federation frauds,—if, in short, "Gomperism" and pure and simpledom continues to prevail, then the A. F. of L. is doomed and all the efforts of its friends in its behalf are futile.

The largest and most dangerous band of "union wreckers" in existence to-day, are the gang of men within the unions, who are seeking to bind labor organizations fast to the falling ruins of capitalism. The whole rotten structure of exploitation and greed is tottering to its downfall, and in its fall it will crush whatever still remains within its walls.

We have received a letter from Comrade S. S. Hobson, of the I. L. P., England, stating that the report published in *The Review* for May that the I. L. P. issued no financial report is incorrect, as such a statement was issued. We cheerfully give place to this correction and only state in defense that we could find no trace of such a report in the I. L. P. papers which were sent to us, and that the Continental Socialist papers also failed to find it, and remarked its absence.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Belgium.

The revolutionary demonstrations and their bloody suppressions are over. The dead are buried, and no one can bring them back to life into the arms of those who loved them. The widows and orphans are facing a future full of anxiety, dreariness and sorrow. The police and soldiers have returned to the more pleasant and less dangerous routine of smoking cigarettes and flirting with the daughters and sisters of the men whom they had faced as deadly foes a few days ago. The ballot has the word for a short moment. What will its verdict be? A great Socialist victory?

Heaven forbid! The hearts of the little bourgeois and penny bond holders, still fluttering under the threats of the rising proletariat, a once sought shelter under the strong wings of the clerical government that had so convincingly demonstrated its power. And away they went, these faint little bourgeois souls, whose eternal blessedness is wrapped up in the paltry little property which they have managed to scrape together in the competitive struggle, and which a stroke of the great capitalist hand may sweep away to-morrow. A vote for capitalism by all means! That was the first and direct effect of the premature talk of violence in Belgium. A victory for the clericals also at the polls!

It was a surprise even for the victors themselves. And yet the psychological motives for such a turn of events in a society so imbued with the idea of property as ours are palpable enough. The elements which might have been won for the cause of Socialism by the work of calm propaganda were frightened off into the capitalist camp by the specter of a revolution with its unknown terrors. And now the work of education must be carried on under added difficulties. That is an education for the educators themselves.

Candidates for Parliament had to be re-elected in 15 old election districts, and 14 new mandates had been created, eight of which belonged to five of these 15 old districts, while six belonged to districts of the other half of the country, which did otherwise not participate in this year's elections. Nearly all of these election districts were clerical strongholds. Out of the total number of votes, the clericals received 1,071,500, the Socialists 476,862, the liberals 499,225, while about 31,000 votes were scattered. Compared with the elections of 1900, the clericals gained 76,444 votes, the Socialists 9,526, and the liberals 1,921. The clericals captured 10 new mandates, the Socialists three, the liberals held their seats in the Chamber but lost two in the Senate, and the

Christian Democrats gained one. The Socialists lost 3,029 votes in the old districts, but gained 12,555 in the six new districts, so that they made a small gain, which, however, appears insignificant beside the enormous increase in the clerical vote.

The Belgian Chamber is now composed of 98 clericals, 34 Socialists, 34 liberals and 2 Christian Democrats. In 1900 the respective figures were 86, 31, 34 and 1. The new Senate contains 62 clericals (formerly 48), 41 liberals (39), and 5 Socialists (5). There will be a clerical majority of 26 in the Chamber and 16 in the Senate, for the next two years.

The clerical power, then, is not yet on the wane. It is still in its rising quadrant, and does not seem to have reached its meridian yet. In 1846, there were 12,000 members of religious orders in the country, in 1900 their number had increased to 31,000 indigenous and 6,000 foreign members. The number of religious settlements in 1846 was 779, but in 1900 this had grown to 1,709. Among 15,828 public school teachers in 1900, 4,240, over one-quarter, were clergymen. This social organization is complemented by an equivalent political organization. Religion, school and politics, with a solid property foundation, that is the happy mixture of matter and mind by which the church will flourish as long as the economic fundament will hold.

The miners are also reminded that politics and economics are inseparable brothers. Hardly are the elections over, when we hear that wages in the Borinage coal district have been reduced 12 per cent. And yet, the bosses sympathized with their employes during the general strike! The times were dull, there was a surplus of coal, and the general strike meant a restriction of the output and a saving of wages. Who would not sympathize under such circumstances? But now, ah, that is different!

There is no use in trying to find excuses for the outcome of the demonstrations and the elections. There is even less in criticising the tactics of the Belgian comrades after the event, or in speculating on the future of the movement for universal suffrage. This movement will win as surely as the progress of economic evolution will draw the bottom from under the feet of the clericals and beat intelligence into the brains of the Belgian workingmen. If the Belgian Socialists were too sanguine in their expectations, if they made mistakes that lead to a useless sacrifice of human lives—all this is human, and we feel sure that our comrades will know how to do better in the future.

France.

A recent number of the Guesdist organ, "Le Socialiste," publishes a list of the Socialist representatives in the Chambre des Deputes, which we reproduce for future reference:

Unite Socialiste Revolutionnaire:

Nine Blanquists—Allard, Bouveri, Chauviere, Contant, Dejeante, Sembat, Thivrier, Vaillant, Walter.

Four Guesdists—Constant, Delory, Dufour, Baron.

Two affiliated Socialists—Benezech, Selle.

Parti Socialiste Francais:

Thirty-two representatives—Aldy, Bagnol, Basly, Boyer, Bouhey.

Allex, Breton, Briand, Camuzet, Cardet, Carnaud, Cadenat, Calvinhac, Charpentier, Colliard, Clovis Hugues, Deveze, Ferrero, Fournier, Gerault-Richard, Jaures, Krauss, Labussiere, Lassalle, Meslier, Millerand, Paschal-Grousset, Pastre, Poulain, Piger, de Pressense, Rouanet, Veber.

La Petite Republique mentions the deputy, Vigne, as the 48th Socialist, but it seems that he is somewhat doubtful, as his name appears also on the list of the radicals.

Immediately after the elections, the Ministry Waldeck-Rousseau resigned. The motives given by the Prime Minister are bad health and the conviction that the Republic is no longer in danger of a royalist reaction, as proven by the vote of the country. The radicals are for a while the ruling element. Not only has the radical Bourgeois been elected President of the Chamber of Deputies, but the new Cabinet is also made up principally of radicals. The new Prime Minister, Combes, is a former radical Senator and the most important portefeuilles are in the hands of the same political party.

It is remarkable, that the new Minister of Finance, Rouvier, is the same man who was compromised in the Panama scandal. The radicals had nobody with banking talents in their own ranks, and so they selected a liberal. The Bourse was so fully alive to the financial ability of the new Minister that the quotations on government bonds rose several points as soon as his acceptance became a fact.

The program of the new Cabinet is everything but radical. Abolition of the law favoring the religious orders and the employment of clergymen in public schools, enforcement of the law against the congregations, reform of military service in favor of a two years' term, and "study" of the question of state control of railroads. The demand for a progressive income tax had to be modified into "tax reform," as Rouvier would not accept the Ministry of Finance on any other condition.

On the eve of the opening of the new Chamber, the "interfederal committee" of the Parti Socialiste Francais celebrated their "success" in the elections with a great banquet. Speeches were made outlining the future policy of the party in the Chamber, which will be to support the Cabinet, providing it adheres to its "radical" program. Millerand has resigned and there is to be no more "individual participation in the government." It will be the aim of the party to control the opposition side of the House. Frequent allusions were made to the "numerical and tactical superiority" of the P. S. F. over the Unite Socialiste Revolutionnaire, and the usual playing with the word "revolution" was in order. The "revolutionary utopianism" of the Marxians was severely criticised and found its noble counterpart in Jaures' "evolutionary utopianism," which will consist in the introduction of "bills for the transformation of great parts of capitalist property into collective property, the reduction of the army and navy, etc.," all of which things he is going to do by the help of the capitalist government in the age of colonial expansion. The speakers were, of course, all in favor of "Unite Socialiste," and the way to bring it about was, according to them, the absorption of the "insignificant" remainder of the U. S. R. We will wait a while, till we hear another song.

The Guesdists have been rather unfortunate lately, no doubt. Not

only was Guesde defeated in the elections, but "Le Petit Sou," the dally of the U. S. R., was also forced to suspend publication. It had been founded by the rich Alfred Edwards, who spent 700,000 francs in trying to put it on a paying basis. Such temporary setbacks do not discourage those who are determined to win, and know that the under dog is bound to have its day.

New Zealand.

A recent report from New Zealand to the London "Clarion" states that the formation of a strong farmers' party has caused the government to neglect the trade unions. A late decision of the Supreme Court forbids the favoring of trade unionists for members of boards of arbitration. Municipal reform is being neglected. Premier Seddon is traveling in Europe and making imperialist speeches. Transportation, gas, water, public market halls are in the hands of monopolists. Well, well! Does that read like a report from the workingmen's paradise? The Socialist party is also growing, Tom Mann being organizer. What is there to organize? Haven't we been told that everybody is happy? Or can it be possible that New Zealand was not on the road to Socialism for a while yet, but simply on the road to Capitalism, and that some of our enthusiastic friends were a little off in their economics?

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

A crisis in the great strike of the anthracite coal miners is rapidly approaching. Probably before this magazine reaches its readers the Indianapolis convention will have been held and cast the die that will determine whether or not a national suspension is to be ordered that will bring the total number of strikers up to 300,000. Every effort to arbitrate and compromise the strike has been spurned by the coal barons, who are determined to destroy the mine workers' organization. Every desertion of weak-kneed men here and there has been joyously heralded broadcast by a subservient press. Every insignificant rumpus between union men and scabs and imported thugs has been duly magnified and led to emphatic demands "that violence must cease," "law and order must be maintained" and "anarchy must be kept down." On top of the autocratic demands of the magnates that the men return to work as individuals, their organs are holding out the threat that only about one-third of the anthracite miners will be re-employed, as the smaller mines will remain closed and many economies will be introduced that will dispense with the need of fully 50,000 workers. The fears of the public are also being aroused by the cry of a "coal famine," which is being raised to prevent funds from being contributed to the miners, to create enmity toward the strikers and to cause dissension among the men. However, the miners are making a gallant fight against all odds.

J. W. Slayton, of the carpenters, has been elected to the City Council in New Castle, Pa., and W. J. Croke, of the flint-glass workers, secured a seat in the Marion (Ind.) Council. Both were delegates to the last A. F. of L. convention and are tireless advocates of Socialism. The Socialists at Linton, Ind., also elected a City Councilman, and in municipal elections in Indiana, New York and other States, lately, the same large gains that have been made by the Socialist party during the past eighteen months, are reported. The vote seems to double and treble—in the Oregon State election, judging from scattering returns, the vote appears to have multiplied four-fold. From everywhere come the most glowing accounts of the increase in Socialist sentiment, and just now great activity is being manifested in nominating State and local tickets and clearing the decks for the fall campaign. The national committee is doing much good work and has a number of able speakers and organizers in the field, but is handicapped for want of funds. An appeal has been sent out by Secretary Greenbaum, pointing out the great good that can be done just at this time if more donations can be secured, and it will probably be heeded and the efficiency of the national body will

be increased. While the strength of the Socialist party is rapidly increasing, workingmen in scores of cities are catching the fever of "labor mayor" victories and advocating independent political action. This new phenomenon should not alarm members of the Socialist party, for the reason that it is an encouraging sign that the working class is escaping from the chains of old-party slavery, and is a sort of halting place in the transition from capitalism to Socialism. The "labor mayor" movement is purely local and will never become national in scope, and if met fairly and tolerantly by Socialists can be gradually brought into the right channel. In the meantime the pure, undefiled, fakirless, skateless and crookless Socialist Labor party is in a state of total dissolution, as about the 37th internal fight is on. A former member of the national committee has sued to recover a loan of \$1,650, another has sued for wages, still another has issued a circular exposing the fraudulent manner in which certain prominents have conducted affairs, while yet another seems to be organizing the disgruntled ones to make war on the few still in control. As a fitting climax the boss has taken a three months' "vacation"—probably to avoid the crash. And a simple-minded member, who bids fair to become an historical character, wrote to inquire of the S. L. P. committee whether "all the rascals are not kicked out yet!" The political horizon seems to be clearing fast enough.

Bros. Morgan and Rockefeller have not been very busy lately, both having been on a vacation. The former visited Europe while the latter has put in his time on his preserves in Cleveland. It is reported, however, that while on the other side of the water Morgan has found time between meals to strengthen his ship combine, gobble a few mines and mills in the Netherlands and secure valuable concessions from the Czar of Russia and other crowned heads, as well as to enlist the Rothschilds in some great financial undertakings that are unknown at present. Rockefeller is said to be investing some of his spare change in such manner as will give him a tighter grip on railroads and iron and steel production, while he also picked up the bicycle trust on the side at a bargain and is reported to be after large automobile interests. Probably these geniuses will startle the dear people in the near future with some gigantic deal, little short of foreclosing their mortgage on the earth.

The A. F. of L. officials are greatly disappointed at the action of Congress in passing the new Chinese exclusion law, which was a compromise or makeshift, and turning down the bill endorsed and advocated by the Federation. President Gompers refers to the new measure as the "Chinese Bunco Bill" in a bitter editorial, and concludes that the law "presents one of the most conspicuous pieces of bungling or vicious legislation, or both, ever enacted by Congress." The cause for all this wrath is found in the fact that the new law permits Chinese coolies to swarm into the country in hordes by way of Mexico and British possessions, and also via the Philippines, as "sailors." Then, again, the Chinese treaty will probably be abrogated in 1904, when the doors will undoubtedly be opened widely. The Federation officials are also resentful because of the manner in which the politicians in Congress are playing ping-pong with the other labor bills. Thus the eight-hour bill went

through the House and was smothered in committee in the Senate, and the bill to create a department of labor and commerce was adopted with a whirl in the Senate and in the House Committee all reference to "labor" was stricken out. Again, the anti-injunction bill was vociferously adopted in the House and when it came before the Senate it was so ridiculously amended that it actually legalized and fostered the injunction curse. The prison labor bill and the seamen's bills were also buried in committee and it is doubtful whether they will ever be resurrected. Those who have opposed the policy of the Federation in begging for favors at the hands of the capitalistic politicians, or at least the expenditure of large sums of money to keep a lobbying committee at Washington, are wondering how much longer the farce is to continue. It is argued that if as much money and energy were spent in educating the working people to an understanding of their rights and how to obtain them through independent political action, by electing men from their own ranks to legislative offices, as the workers of Europe and Australia are doing, much more would be gained in the long run. Just what tale of woe will be unfolded by the A. F. of L. President, Executive Board and Legislative Committee at New Orleans we shall perhaps learn later on.

Probably the most widely discussed occurrence in the trade-union movement during the past month was the action taken by the three national unions—the Western Labor Union, the Western Federation of Miners and the Hotel and Restaurant Employees—which met in Denver. All three organizations adopted uncompromising declarations in favor of Socialism. They went even farther and decided to call conventions in the Western States, nominate tickets, circulate literature and carry on an active propaganda among the working people in advocacy of the abolition of the wage system and the inauguration of the co-operative commonwealth. Much of the credit for the change in the policies of these organizations is due Eugene V. Debs and Father Hagerty, a Catholic priest, who has given up his pulpit to take the stump for the Socialist party, both of whom were guests of the Denver conventions. Presidents Boyce and McDonald, of the first-named unions, advised the delegates, in submitting their annual reports to take an advanced stand politically and industrially. The recommendations were thoroughly discussed and carried by overwhelming majorities when the vote was taken. The hotel and restaurant workers will take a referendum vote on the proposition, but it is generally admitted that Socialism will prevail. In addition to the Western agitators who will proselyte for the cause of Socialism, Debs, Father Hagerty and W. H. Wise will open headquarters in Denver and carry on an aggressive campaign throughout the Mountain States. During the last few weeks Debs has toured Montana, Washington and British Columbia and received great ovations wherever he went. Besides making a stand for Socialism, the Western Labor Union changed its name to American Labor Union, and, it is reported, will make an active effort to bring working people in the East to its standard. Opinion is divided as to whether or not the A. L. U. will be successful in gaining a strong foothold in the Eastern country, owing to the position occupied by the A. F. of L. The partisans of

the new body, however, argue that there are millions of workers yet to be organized, and, because of the conservatism of the Federation, there is room for a more progressive organization. Some of the extremists in both bodies are predicting war to the knife, but they do not pretend to explain just what is to be accomplished by a course of that kind.

Some important changes have taken place in the official composition of several national unions during the past month. Ed. Lynch, President of the metal polishers and brass workers' organization, has been defeated for re-election, Nick Duttle, of Dayton, having succeeded him. L. R. Thomas, President of the patternmakers, has given place to James Wilson, of Erie. President Lynch has been re-elected in the Typographical Union, as was also Secretary Bramwood, while the A. F. of L. delegation for the next two years will be composed of Wm. Garrett, of Washington; Max. Hayes, of Cleveland, and Frank Morrison, of Chicago, who is the present Secretary of the Federation. President Higgins has been re-elected by the printing pressmen, and John Mulholland, of the metal mechanics. There are several other contests on in the national bodies. It is rumored that P. J. McGuire will attempt to recover his former position as Secretary of the carpenters. J. W. Slayton will be a candidate for re-election to the A. F. of L. in the same union, and Harry Thomas, of Cleveland, will make a contest for the Federation in the Amalgamated Carpenters, and Isaac Cowen will quite likely do the same thing in the Amalgamated Engineers. John P. Sheridan, of Cleveland, another radical, has been elected delegate to the Federation in the iron and steel workers, who also re-elected President Shaffer. The progressive element everywhere seems to be making an attempt to push to the front in the labor organizations.

BOOK REVIEWS

"Chapters in the History of the Arts and Crafts Movement. By Oscar Lovell Triggs. Published by the Bohemian Guild of the Industrial Art League.

With its uncut deckel edges, broad margins, beautiful type (for a modern type founder's work), this book is a joy to look upon and handle. Nor is one disappointed in the contents, for it is really a valuable contribution to the literature of the new social revolt. The growth of the movement toward the return of art to the workshop and the home of the worker is traced through the writings and lives of Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris, with a review of the present day work of Ashbee, the Rookwood pottery and some of the other efforts now being made to realize the ideals of these thinkers. Carlyle insisted on the essential nobleness of creative work, on the necessity of truthfulness in production, and in the superiority of "doing" rather than saying. "Mistaken in nearly all points relating to political democracy, he was always right in discussing questions of industry, and his dream of some 'chivalry of labor' is even now being realized—the complete democratizing of labor, which Carlyle actually feared, being reserved for a distant future. * * * Carlyle's word fell upon the ear of a young man then idling in Switzerland, and employing an astonishing literary skill in describing objects of nature and art—but presently to become something quite other than a literary dilettante, a something more even than Carlyle; namely, a Socialist in both word and deed. * * * When Mr. Ruskin came to examine into the subject practically, he found that * * * wider questions were complicated with this of art—nothing short of the fundamental principles of human intercourse and social economy." He saw that "a certain amount of leisure, a certain amount of skill, and a certain amount of intelligence, are requisite for the best work. Given, then, ideal conditions for work, what profits should a man have for his labor? The essential reward lies naturally in the happiness which the work engenders. Labor that is wholesome exercise, involving the skill, and intelligence and character of the individual, is not really labor in the Ruskinian sense, for there is no expense of life. By the recognition of the human values of labor the question of wages is rendered of secondary moment. The real demand of workmen who have not been degraded or corrupted by the mammonism of the day is not for higher wages but for better conditions of labor. The assumption that a man is a repository of energy to be elicited by wages alone is unworthy any observer of men. The wage system is but another form of the chattel slavery it superseded, and wages, high or low, is still a

token of bondage. The distinguishing sign of slavery, Ruskin said, 'is to have a price and to be bought for it.' The best work of poets, artists, and scientists is never paid for, nor can the value of toil in these fields be measured in terms of money." But both Carlyle and Ruskin were antagonistic to democracy and hence incapable of giving rise to a real Socialist movement. "In their moods of doubt both thinkers proclaimed the need of a nation's governance by its superior members—the aristoi by divine sanction, who should be leaders and rulers in a state of natural feudalism." With William Morris, however, the chain of thought was completed. Yet he approached the subject from the literary and constructive side rather than the exclusively political. "In the order of his development poetry preceded and then coincided with his craft, his craft preceded and then coincided with his Socialism. * * * He divides work into three classes: Mechanical, Intelligent and Imaginative. The first kind is done under compulsion, without thought and without any inherent reward. The second kind is work that can be done better or worse, and which if well done claims attention from the workman, and requires the impress of his individuality; it is not too toilsome, and is done with some degree of pleasure. The third kind rises above the second in degree only; it is altogether individual, and is all pleasure—fertile of deeds gainful to mankind. * * * The problem of the world is then to change the lower form of labor into the higher, and in the light of this problem the questions of commerce, machinery, and the division of labor must be considered." The following quotation from a letter written by William Morris in January, 1896, is such an excellent summary of his whole position that it is well worth reproduction: "My view on the point of the relation between art and Socialism is as follows: Society (so-called) at present is organized entirely for the benefit of a privileged class; the working class being only considered in the arrangement as so much machinery. This involves perpetual and enormous waste, and the organization for the production of genuine utilities is only a secondary consideration. This waste lands the whole civilized world in a position of artificial poverty, which again debars men of all classes from satisfying their rational desires. Rich men are in slavery to philistinism, poor men to penury. We can none of us have what we want, except (partially only) by making prodigious sacrifices, which very few men can ever do. Before, therefore, we can so much as hope for any art, we must be free from this artificial poverty. When we are thus free, in my opinion, the natural instincts of mankind toward beauty and incident will take their due place; we shall want art, and since we shall be really wealthy, we shall be able to have what we want." In his comments on the "Rookwood Pottery" of Cincinnati, Prof. Triggs says: "So long as the factory is organized to the end of making profits for some owner and director, an issue of production in art is practically impossible. The wage slavery of the factory forbids art; the machine forbids it; competition forbids it; the methods of designing and executing by division of labor are against it." After having thus clearly set forth that it is the competitive, private-property, profit-seeking element in modern society that is at war with all good, artistic, creative labor. Prof. Triggs still looks for some "man of millions, convinced of the gospel of labor," to make possible the realization of ideal industrial

work-shops. He sees nothing of the great revolt of the workers who is really destined to usher in the conditions for which he longs and is blind to all the great industrial tendencies that are working for abolition of the conditions of which he complains.

A Persian Pearl, and Other Essays. By Clarence S. Darrow. C. Ricketts, Chicago. Art cover, uncut edges. 160 pp. \$1.

There are five decidedly remarkable essays in this book, all of them presenting some literary subject in the light of Socialist philosophy. The first on "A Persian Pearl," is an exposition of the pessimistic philosophy of the "Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam." The next two are Walt Whitman and Robert Burns, respectively, and the fourth is one with which most Socialists are familiar, entitled "Realism in Literature and Art." The final one, on "The Skeleton in the Closet,"—from a literary point of view—perhaps the most beautiful of the book. But it is too much of a plea for the blessings of adversity to be in accord with modern philosophy or the other essays in the book. The page and initials are handsomely illuminated, and the uncut edges, generally tasteful design does credit to Mr. C. L. Ricketts. The book would make a beautiful present for birthday or other time of remembrance of friends.

Britain for the British. By Robert Blatchford. Charles H. Kerr Company. Cloth, 177 pp., 50c; paper, 25c.

Probably few people outside of the Socialist movement, and not a few within that movement, are aware that the book that has had the largest sale of any book published in the last fifty years was a Socialist book. "Merrie England," by Robert Blatchford, has had a sale of over 2,000,000 copies and is still selling at a rate that would put many of the popular novels in the shade. On any principle of comparison "Britain for the British" should have an even larger circulation. It is a beautiful book. It is written in the same popular entertaining style. It comes at a time when there is much more of a demand for Socialist literature. The names of a few of the chapters will give an idea of the subject matter. "What Is Wealth? Where Does It Come From? Who Creates It?" "How the Few Get Rich and Keep the Many Poor," "What Socialism Is Not," "What Socialism Is," "The Need for a Labor Party," "Why the Old Parties Will Not Do." For propaganda work among those who know nothing of Socialism, for "setting people thinking" for a "starter," "Britain for the British" is unexcelled. There is a little too much of an inclination toward State Socialism to be wholly in accord with scientific Socialism, and it will need to be followed by a thorough literature. But its reading will make the unconverted eager to know more about Socialism, and there is plenty of literature which will give this higher education. This is a book not so much for the library of the student as the armory of the propagandist.

Crime and Its Relation to Social Progress. By Arthur Cleveland F. B. Columbia University Press. Macmillan Co., Agents. Cloth, 128 pp. \$3.50.

The thesis of this book is clearly stated in the preface, as follows: "Careful study of the writings of criminal anthropologists has strengthened the conviction that, in calling attention so forcibly to the physiological and psychological study of individual degeneration as the es-

tial fact in criminology, we have been drawn away from another side of the truth, perhaps equally important, namely: the evolutionary function and usefulness of crime and punishment. Crime is in large part a social product, increasing with the growth of knowledge, intelligence and social morality, increasing because of this growth. The persistent enlargement of the field of crime is a necessity for all truly progressive nations. Many acts, formerly harmless, or socially beneficial, become harmful as civilization grows higher and more complex. An increase of crime, however, does not mean necessarily an increase of anti-social conduct. In fact, anti-social acts may have diminished while crime has grown larger in amount, or may have increased while crime has decreased. Society's conflict with its criminal members, due to the enforcement of new social prohibitions, is one of the chief means by which humanity, in every age, has risen from a lower to a higher plane of civilization, from almost uncontrolled license, selfishness and hate, into true liberty, love and mutual helpfulness." A vast array of evidence is then marshalled from the fields of biology, ethnology and history, ancient and modern, to substantiate this thesis. Whatever we may think of his conclusions the author has assembled a mass of information which renders his book invaluable to the worker in this field of sociology. But when we come to examine the thesis, over which so much is made, we find that he has simply said in longer words and more complex sentences what hundreds and even thousands of writers have said before him, that punishment is simply society's method of casting out the unfit. What he has never a glimpse of is that the choice of the unfit is always made by a ruling class and may sometimes be wrongly made, and hence tend to retrogression. Although he has collected an elaborate bibliography, he does not seem to have heard of Enrico Ferri's "Criminal Sociology," the most epoch-making work ever published in the realm of criminology, and when he does refer to another of Ferri's works he has forgotten how to spell his name. It never occurs to the author that conditions might be so shaped as to avoid the production of criminals and thus secure social advance at a much less expenditure of energy. He sees no connection between economic injustice and crime and evidently seems to think that the only way to eliminate any "unfit" element is to keep on producing it and then kill it when produced. The material gathered is infinitely better than the reasoning about that material, and the book is far more of a contribution to the field of fact than that of theory. Some one should use the very valuable material he has gathered to write a real social theory of crime.

The Socialist Movement. By Rev. Charles H. Vall. Paper, 31 pp., 10 cents.

This is an excellent little book to hand to the man who has had his interest aroused by a leaflet, a Socialist newspaper, or a speech and who is willing and able to do a little serious thinking. An immense amount of good, solid thought and reasoning has been crammed within the pages of this work, and it is well worth the reading of even those who think themselves familiar with Socialist doctrines.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Bound Volumes of the Review.

With the present issue The International Socialist Review has reached its third volume. A limited number of the sets of the Review printed have been bound in two handsome volumes of the same style, each containing over 800 pages. They constitute a history of International Socialism and of Socialist thought that is unequalled in anything else in the English language, and is on a par with the best of the reviews of continental Europe. Volume I., of which only 200 copies remain, contains the numbers from July, 1901, to June, 1902. The price is \$2.00 a volume, including postage, to any address.

Special Limited Offer.

To any one sending cash with order before August 15, 1902, we will send Volume II., in cloth binding, and a year's subscription for \$2.25, or both bound volumes and a year's subscription for \$3.50. This includes prepayment of expressage on the volumes.

Premiums for Three New Subscriptions.

To any one sending us before August 15 \$3.00 with the names of three new yearly subscribers to The International Socialist Review, we will send either one of the two bound volumes, or, if preferred, a copy of the standard English edition of Marx's Capital, sold by us at \$2.00 and by others at \$2.50. We pay expressage.

Trial Subscriptions.

To introduce The International Socialist Review to new readers, and to provide the best Socialist literature for the fall campaign at the lowest possible cost, we will send the magazine three months to ten names for \$1.00 and to additional names sent in by the same subscriber within a month at the same rate of 10 cents each. This is, of course, much less than the cost of publication, and we can only afford it because experience has shown that a large proportion of the trial

subscribers will stay with us. Every reader of 'The Review' should take this matter up at once. A very little effort will find ten people who will only be too glad to get 'The Review' three months for 10 cents, a third of the regular price. This offer does not apply to Chicago, where we have to pay two cents postage on every copy. Chicago Socialists can, however, get back numbers of 'The Review' for propaganda use at less than cost by calling at our office.

A New Socialist Drama.

We have just published a new Socialist drama, entitled "Under the Lash," the author being Comrade C. F. Quinn, of Wilkesbarre, Pa. It is by all odds the strongest dramatic work that the Socialist movement of America has yet produced. The stage setting is simple and the play is well adapted to the needs of amateurs. It has already been successfully produced in Chicago and will be welcomed in other cities. Price 25 cents; no discount except to stockholders. A Socialist club purchasing twelve copies will be permitted to produce the play once. Further productions must be by special arrangement. The author has contributed his share of the profits from the play to assist in the work of Socialist propaganda.

Campaign Literature.

We are issuing a new series of four-page propaganda leaflets at less than cost, to assist the work of building up the Socialist party. Five of these leaflets are now ready—"Who Are the Socialists," "A Country Where Strikes Don't Fail," "Why Join the Socialist Party," "Socialism Defined by Socialists," and "Labor Politics." The first four are by Charles H. Kerr, the last by A. M. Simons. The last page of each leaflet is headed with the words, "You are invited to a Socialist meeting at," under which a blank space is left for inserting place and time of meeting with a rubber stamp. For the accommodation of comrades who cannot get rubber stamps of local dealers we will mail a two-line stamp and an inking pad for 30 cents. A plan which has worked well is to select a prominent street corner and hold regular weekly meetings. For example, have your stamps made to read: "Corner of State and Second street; every Saturday evening at 7:30. Then distribute a different leaflet with the same stamping each week and watch the growth of your crowds, your membership and your vote. These leaflets would cost at least \$2.00 a thousand to print in small quantities. Our price is 50 cents a thousand, if we prepay charges, 25 cents a thousand if sent by express at purchaser's expense.

Socialist Literature for the Striking Coal Miners.

The work of Mother Jones and other Socialist workers have made the striking coal-miners ready and anxious to learn more of Socialism. Several active comrades are now working with every energy at their

disposal to show the miners the way to end all strikes and industrial slavery. But something more permanent than the spoken word is needed, if that word is to have its best effect. Every Socialist speaker in the mines at present is sorely in need of Socialist literature. More important still, there are hundreds of Socialists in the mining fields who are not public speakers, but who, if supplied with plenty of good literature would become centers of effective Socialist propaganda. Funds for such literature must come from outside the strike field. The publishers of this Review have already done something in the way of sending such literature to those who are in need of it. We could do infinitely more had we the necessary funds. So we are asking the readers of the International Socialist Review to help us with whatever sums they can afford, to be expended for Socialist books and pamphlets. For all sums that are sent us we will mail as much literature as it will pay for at our stockholders' prices. As these prices are practically at cost of production, a few dollars will supply a great amount of reading matter. Do not wait, but send in what you can afford at once as time is precious. Add a dollar at least to your next book order, or send in a dollar or more without waiting for any other order. All money will be receipted for through the columns of the International Socialist Review.

Marx's Capital.

Our imported edition of Marx's Capital is now ready. It is the best edition published, printed from the plates which were made under the personal supervision of Frederick Engels. The price in England is half a guinea, in New York \$2.50. Our price is \$2.00 postpaid; to our stockholders \$1.30 by mail or \$1.00 by express, at purchaser's expense; \$10.00 down or \$2.00 a month for five months makes you a full-paid stockholder in our co-operative company, with no liability of any kind, and with the privilege of buying all our books at cost price.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

AUGUST, 1902.

NO. 2.

Wanted; A New Law of Development.

Evolution is no longer a mere tentative hypothesis. One by one, step by step, each division and subdivision of science has contributed its evidence, until now the case is complete and the verdict rendered. While there is still discussion as to the method of evolution, none the less, as a process sufficient to explain all biological phenomena, all differentiations of life into widely diverse species, families, and even kingdoms, evolution is flatly accepted. Likewise has been accepted its law of development: That, in the struggle for existence, the strong and fit and the progeny of the strong and fit have a better opportunity for survival than the weak and less fit and the progeny of the weak and less fit.*

It is in the struggle of the species with other species and against all other hostile forces in the environment, that this law operates; also in the struggle between the individuals of the same species. In this struggle, which is for food and shelter, the weak individuals must obviously win less food and shelter than the strong. Because of this, their hold on life relaxes and they are eliminated forthwith. And for the same reason that they may not win for themselves adequate food and shelter, the weak cannot give to their progeny the chance for survival that the strong do. And thus, since the weak are prone to beget weakness, the species is constantly purged of its inefficient members.

Because of this a premium is placed upon strength, and so long as the struggle for food and shelter obtains, just so long will the average strength of each generation rise. On the other hand, should conditions so change that all, and the progeny of all, the weak as well as the strong, have an equal chance for survival, then, at once, the average strength of each generation will begin to fall. Never yet, however, in animal life, has there been such a state of affairs. Natural selection has always obtained. The

*Benjamin Kidd has well worded this biological law.

strong and their progeny, at the expense of the weak, have always survived. This law of development has operated down all the past upon all life; it so operates to-day, and it is not rash to say that it will continue to operate in the future—at least upon all life existing in a state of nature.

Man, pre-eminent though he is in the animal kingdom and capable of reacting upon and making suitable an unsuitable environment, nevertheless remains the creature of this same law of development. The social selection he is subject to is merely another form of natural selection. True, within certain narrow limits he modifies the struggle for existence and renders less precarious the tenure of life for the weak. The extremely weak, diseased, and inefficient, are housed in hospitals and asylums. The strength of the viciously strong, when inimical to society, is tempered by penal institutions and by the gallows. The shortsighted are provided with spectacles, and the sickly (when they can pay for it) with sanitariums. Pestilential marshes are drained, plagues are checked, and disasters averted. Yet, for all that, the strong and the progeny of the strong survive, and the weak are crushed out. The men, strong of brain, are masters as of yore. They dominate society and gather to themselves the wealth of society. With this wealth they maintain themselves and equip their progeny for the struggle. They build their homes in healthy places, purchase the best fruits, meats, and vegetables the market affords, and buy themselves the ministrations of the most brilliant and learned of the professional classes. The weak man, as of yore, is the servant, the doer of things at the master's beck and call. The weaker and less efficient he is, the poorer is his reward. The weakest work for a living wage (when they can get work), live in unsanitary slums, on vile and insufficient food, at the lowest depths of human degradation. Their grasp on life is indeed precarious, their mortality excessive, their infant death rate appalling.

That some should be born to preferment and others to ignominy in order that the race may progress, is cruel and sad; but none the less they are so born. The weeding out of human souls, some for fatness and smiles, some for leanness and tears, is surely a heartless selective process—as heartless as it is natural. And the human family, for all its wonderful record of adventure and achievement, has not yet succeeded in abolishing this process. That it is incapable of doing this is not to be hazarded. Not only is it capable, but the whole trend of society is in that direction. All the social forces are driving man on to a time when the old selective law will be annulled. There is no escaping it, save by the intervention of catastrophes and cataclysms utterly unthinkable. It is inexorable. It is inexorable because the common man demands it. The twentieth century, the common

man says, is his day; the common man's day, or, rather, the dawning of the common man's day.

Nor can it be denied. The evidence is with him. The previous centuries, and more notably the nineteenth, have marked the rise of the common man. From chattel slavery to serfdom, and from serfdom to what he bitterly terms "wage slavery," he has upreared. Never was he so strong as he is to-day, and never so menacing. He does the work of the world, and he is beginning to know it. The world cannot get along without him, and this also he is beginning to know. All the human knowledge of the past, all the scientific discovery, governmental experiment, and invention of machinery, have tended to his advancement. His standard of living is higher. His common school education would shame princes ten centuries past. His civil and religious liberty make him a free man, and his ballot the peer of his betters. And all this has tended to make him conscious, conscious of himself, conscious of his class. He looks about him and questions that ancient law of development. It is cruel and wrong, he is beginning to declare. It is an anachronism. Let it be abolished. Why should there be one empty belly in all the world, when the work of ten men can feed a hundred? What if my brother be not so strong as I? He has not sinned. Wherefore should he hunger? he and his sinless little ones? Down with the old law. There is food and shelter for all, therefore let all receive food and shelter.

As fast as labor has become conscious, it has organized. The ambition of these class-conscious men is that the movement shall become general, that all labor shall become conscious of itself and its class interests. And the day that witnesses the solidarity of labor, they triumphantly affirm, will be a day when labor dominates the world. This growing consciousness has led to the organization of two movements, both separate and distinct, but both converging toward a common goal—one, the labor movement, known as Trade Unionism; the other, the political movement, known as Socialism. Both are grim and silent forces, unheralded, and virtually unknown by the general public save in moments of stress. The sleeping labor giant receives no notice from the capitalistic press, and when he stirs uneasily, a column of surprise, indignation, and horror suffices.

It is only now and then, after long periods of silence, that the labor movement puts in its claim for notice. All is quiet. The kind old world spins on, and the bourgeois masters clip their coupons in smug complacency. But the grim and silent forces are at work. Suddenly, like a clap of thunder from a clear sky, comes a disruption of industry. From ocean to ocean the wheels of a great chain of railroads cease to run. A quarter of a million miners throw down pick and shovel and outrage the sun with their pale,

bleached faces. The street railways of a swarming metropolis stand idle, or the rumble of machinery in vast manufactories dies away to shocking silence. There is alarm and panic. Arson and homicide stalk forth. There is a cry in the night, and quick anger and sudden death. Peaceful cities are affrighted by the crack of rifles and the snarl of machine guns, and the hearts of the shuddering are shaken by the roar of dynamite. There is hurrying and skurrying. The wires are kept hot between the center of government and the seat of trouble. The chiefs of state ponder gravely and advise, and governors of States implore. There is assembling of militia and massing of troops, and the streets resound to the tramp of armed men. There are separate and joint conferences between the captains of industry and the captains of labor. And then, finally, all is quiet again, and the memory of it is like the memory of a bad dream.

But these strikes become hegiras, olympiads, things to date from; and common on the lips of men become such phrases as "The Great Dock Strike," "The Great Coal Strike," "The Great Railroad Strike." Never before did labor do these things. After the Great Plague in England labor, finding itself in demand, and innocently obeying the economic law, asked higher wages. But the masters set a maximum wage, restrained workmen from moving about from place to place, refused to tolerate idlers, and by most barbarous legal methods punished those who disobeyed. But labor is accorded greater respect to-day. Such a policy, put into effect in this the first decade of the twentieth century, would sweep the masters from their seats in one mighty crash. And the masters know it and are respectful.

A fair instance of the growing solidarity of labor is afforded by an unimportant strike in San Francisco. The restaurant cooks and waiters were completely unorganized, working at any and all hours for whatever wages they could get. A representative of the American Federation of Labor went among them and organized them. Within a few weeks nearly two thousand men were enrolled, and they had five thousand dollars on deposit. Then they put in their demand for increased wages and shorter hours. Forthwith their employers organized. The demand was denied, and the Cooks' and Waiters' Union walked out.

All organized employers stood back of the restaurant owners, in sympathy with them and willing to aid them if they dared. And at the back of the Cooks' and Waiters' Union stood the organized labor of the city, 40,000 strong. If a business man were caught patronizing an "unfair" restaurant, he was boycotted; if a union man were caught, he was fined heavily by his union. The oyster companies and the slaughter houses made an attempt to refuse to sell oysters and meat to union restaurants. The Butchers and Meat

Cutters, and the Teamsters, in retaliation, refused to work for or to deliver to non-union restaurants. Upon this the oyster companies and slaughter houses backed down and peace reigned. But the Restaurant Bakers in non-union places were ordered out, and the Bakery Wagon Drivers declined to deliver to unfair houses.

Every American Federation of Labor union in the city is prepared to strike, and waits only the word. And behind all, a handful of men, known as the Labor Council, direct the fight. One by one, blow upon blow, they are able to call out the unions—the Laundry Workers, who do the washing; the Hackmen, who haul men to and from restaurants; the Butchers, Meat Cutters, and Teamsters; and the Milkers, Milk Drivers, and Chicken Pickers; and after that, in pure sympathy, the Retail Clerks, the Horse Shoers, the Gas and Electrical Fixture Hangers, the Metal Roofers, the Blacksmiths, the Blacksmiths' Helpers, the Stablemen, the Machinists, the Brewers, the Coast Seamen, the Varnishers and Polishers, the Confectioners, the Upholsterers, the Paper Hangers and Fresco Painters, the Drug Clerks, the Fitters and Helpers, the Metal Workers, the Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, the Assistant Undertakers, the Carriage and Wagon Workers, and so on down the lengthy list of organizations. And over all these trades, over all these thousands of men, is the Labor Council. When it speaks its voice is heard, and when it orders it is obeyed. But it, in turn, is dominated by the National Labor Council, with which it is constantly in touch.

In this wholly unimportant little local strike it is of interest to note the stands taken by the different sides. The legal representative and official mouthpiece of the Employers' Association says: "This organization is formed for defensive purposes, and it may be driven to take offensive steps, and if so, will be strong enough to follow them up. Labor cannot be allowed to dictate to capital and say how business shall be conducted. There is no objection to the formation of unions and trades councils, but membership must not be compulsory. It is repugnant to the American idea of liberty and cannot be tolerated."

On the other hand, the president of the Team Drivers' Union says: "The employers of labor in this city are generally against the trade union movement, and there seems to be a concerted effort on their part to check the progress of organized labor. Such action as has been taken by them in sympathy with the present labor troubles may, if continued, lead to a serious conflict, the outcome of which might be most calamitous for the business and industrial interests of San Francisco."

And the secretary of the United Brewery Workmen: "I regard a sympathetic strike as the last weapon which organized labor should use in its defense. When, however, associations of em-

ployers band together to defeat organized labor, or one of its branches, then we should not and will not hesitate ourselves to employ the same instrument in retaliation."

Thus, in a little corner of the world, is exemplified the growing solidarity of labor. The organization of labor has not only kept pace with the organization of industry, but it has gained upon it. In one winter, in the anthracite coal region, \$160,000,000 in mines and \$600,000,000 in transportation and distribution consolidated its ownership and control. And at once, arrayed as solidly on the other side, were the 150,000 anthracite miners. The bituminous mines, however, were not consolidated; yet the 250,000 men employed therein were already combined. And not only that, but they were also combined with the anthracite miners, these 400,000 men being under the control and direction of one supreme labor council. And in this and the other great councils are to be found captains of labor of splendid abilities, who, in understanding of economic and industrial conditions, are undeniably equal to the best of their opponents, the captains of industry.

Just the other day the United States Steel Corporation was organized with total securities issued of \$1,404,000,000. The workers in many of the lesser corporations absorbed, such as the American Tin Plate Company and the Steel Hoop Company, were organized under the Amalgamated Iron, Steel and Tin Workers' Association. But the workers in a number of the corporations absorbed, were not, but proceeded at once to organize. Seven men were discharged for taking part in the forming of an Amalgamated union in one of the mills of the American Sheet Steel Company. Their four hundred fellow workmen immediately walked out, and the great United States Steel Corporation found itself face to face with its bristling 200,000 employes. President Schwab, who receives a salary of a million a year for his wisdom, wisely ordered the seven discharged men back, and an armed truce for a few weeks was established.

The United States is honeycombed with labor organizations. And the big federations which these go to compose aggregate millions of members, and in their various branches handle millions of dollars yearly. And not only this; for the international brotherhoods and unions are forming, and moneys for the aid of strikers pass back and forth across the seas. The Machinists, in their demand for a nine-hour day, affect 500,000 men in the United States, Mexico, and Canada. In England the membership of working class organizations is approximated by Keir Hardie at 2,500,000, with reserve funds of \$18,000,000. There the co-operative movement has a membership of 1,500,000, and every year turns over in distribution more than \$100,000,000. In France, one-eighth of the whole working class is unionized. In Bel-

gium the unions are very rich and powerful, and so able to defy the masters that many of the smaller manufacturers, unable to resist, "are removing their works to other countries where the workmen's organizations are not so potential." And in all other countries, according to the stage of their economic and political development, like figures obtain. And Europe, to-day, confesses that her greatest social problem is the labor problem, and that it is the one most closely engrossing the attention of her statesmen.

The organization of labor is one of the chief acknowledged factors in the retrogression of British trade. The workers have become class conscious as workers have never before. The wrong of one is the wrong of all. They have come to realize, in a short-sighted way, that their masters' interests are not their interests. The harder they work, they believe, the more wealth they create for their masters. Further, the more work they do in one day, the fewer men will be needed to do the work. So the unions place a day's stint upon their members, beyond which they are not permitted to go. In "A Study of Trade Unionism," by Benjamin Taylor, in the "Nineteenth Century" of April, 1898, is furnished some interesting corroborations. The facts here set forth were collected by the Executive Board of the Employers' Federation, the documentary proofs of which are in the hands of the secretaries. In a certain firm the union workmen made eight ammunition boxes a day. Nor could they be persuaded into making more. A young Swiss, who could not speak English, was set to work, and in the first day he made fifty boxes. In the same firm the skilled union hands filed up the outside handles of one machine gun a day. That was their stint. No one was known to ever do more. A non-union filer came into the shop and did twelve a day. A Manchester firm found that to plane a large bed-casting took union workmen 190 hours, and non-union workmen 135 hours. In another instance a man, resigning from his union, day by day did double the amount of work he had done formerly. And to cap it all, an English gentleman, going out to look at a wall being put up for him by union bricklayers, found one of their number with his right arm strapped to his body, doing all the work with his left arm—forsooth, because he was such an energetic fellow that otherwise he would involuntarily lay more bricks than his union permitted.

All England resounds to the cry: "Wake up, England!" But the sulky giant is not stirred. "Let England's trade go to pot," he says, "what have I to lose?" And England is powerless. The capacity of her workmen is represented by 1, in comparison with the $2\frac{1}{4}$ capacity of the American workman. And because of the solidarity of labor and the destructiveness of strikes, British capitalists dare not even strive to emulate the enterprise of American

capitalists. So England watches trade slipping through her fingers and wails unavailingly. As a correspondent writes: "The enormous power of the trade unions hangs, a sullen cloud, over the whole industrial world here, affecting men and masters alike."

The political movement known as Socialism is, perhaps, even less realized by the general public. The great strides it has taken and the portentous front it to-day exhibits are undreamed of; and, fastened though it is to every land, it is given little space by the capitalistic press. For all its plea and passion and warmth, it wells upward like a great cold tidal wave, irresistible, inexorable, engulfing present-day society level by level. By its own preachment it is inexorable. Just as sure as societies have sprung into existence, fulfilled their function, and passed away, just so sure is present society hastening on to its dissolution. This is a transition period—and destined to be a very short one. Barely a century old, capitalism is ripening so rapidly that it can never live to see a second birthday. There is no hope for it, the Socialists say. It is doomed, doomed, doomed.

The cardinal tenet of Socialism is that forbidding doctrine, the materialistic conception of history. Men are not the masters of their souls. They are the puppets of great, blind forces. The lives they live and the deaths they die are compulsory. All social codes are but the reflexes of existing economic conditions, plus certain survivals of past economic conditions. The institutions men build they are compelled to build. Economic laws determine at any given time what these institutions shall be, how long they shall operate, and by what they shall be replaced. And so, through the economic process, the Socialist preaches the ripening of the capitalistic society and the coming of the new co-operative society.

The second great tenet of Socialism, itself a phase of the materialistic conception of history, is the class struggle. In the social struggle for existence, men are forced into classes. "The history of all society thus far is the history of class strife." In existing society the capitalist class exploits the working class, the proletariat. The interests of the exploiter are not the interests of the exploited. "Profits are legitimate," says the one. "Profits are unpaid wages," replies the other, when he has become conscious of his class, "therefore, profits are robbery." The capitalist enforces his profits because he is the legal owner of all the means of production. He is the legal owner, because he controls the political machinery of society. The Socialist sets himself to work to capture the political machinery, so that he may make illegal the capitalist's ownership of the means of production, and make legal his own ownership of the means of production. And it is this struggle, between these two classes, upon which the world has at last entered.

Scientific Socialism is very young. Only yesterday it was in swaddling clothes. But to-day it is a vigorous young giant, well-braced to battle for what it wants, and knowing precisely what it wants. It holds its international conventions, where world-policies are formulated by the representatives of millions of Socialists. In little Belgium there are three-quarters of a million of men who work for the cause; in Germany, 2,500,000; Austria, between 1895 and 1897, raised her Socialist vote from 90,000 to 750,000. France in 1871 had a whole generation of Socialists wiped out, yet in 1885 there were 30,000, and in 1898, 1,000,000. And so in various countries.

Ere the last Spaniard had evacuated Cuba, Socialist groups were forming. And from far Japan, in these first days of the twentieth century, writes one, Tomoyoshi Murai: "The interest of our people on Socialism has been greatly awakened these days, especially among our laboring people on one hand and young students' circle on the other, as much as we can draw an earnest and enthusiastic audience and fill our hall, which holds two thousand. . . . It is gratifying to say that we have a number of fine and well-trained public orators among our leaders of Socialism in Japan. The first speaker to-night is Mr. Kiyoshi Kawakami, editor of one of our city (Tokyo) dailies, a strong, independent, and decidedly socialistic paper, circulated far and wide. Mr. Kawakami is a scholar as well as a popular writer. He is going to speak to-night on the subject, 'The Essence of Socialism—the Fundamental Principles.' The next speaker is Professor Iso Abe, president of our association, whose subject of address is, 'Socialism and the Existing Social System.' The third speaker is Mr. Naoe Kinosita, the editor of another strong journal of the city. He speaks on the subject, 'How to Realize the Socialist Ideals and Plans.' Next is Mr. Shigeyoshi Sugiyama, a graduate of Hartford Theological Seminary and an advocate of Social Christianity, who is to speak on 'Socialism and Municipal Problems.' And the last speaker is the editor of the 'Labor World,' the foremost leader of the labor union movement in our country, Mr. Sen Katayama, who speaks on the subject, 'The Outlook of Socialism in Europe and America.' These addresses are going to be published in book form and to be distributed among our people to enlighten their minds on the subject."

And in the struggle for the political machinery of society, Socialism is no longer confined to mere propaganda. Italy, Austria, Belgium, England, have Socialist members in their national bodies. Out of the one hundred and thirty-two members of the London County Council, ninety-one are denounced by the conservative element as Socialists. The Emperor of Germany grows anxious and angry at the increasing numbers which are returned to the

Reichstag. In France, many of the large cities, such as Marseilles, are in the hands of the Socialists. A large body of them are in the Chamber of Deputies, and Millerand, Socialist, sits in the cabinet. Of him M. Leroy-Beaulieu says with horror: "M. Millerand is the open enemy of private property, private capital, the resolute advocate of the socialization of production a constant incitement to violence a collectivist, avowed and militant, taking part in the government, dominating the departments of commerce and industry, preparing all the laws and presiding at the passage of all measures which should be submitted to merchants and tradesmen."

In the United States there are already Socialist mayors of towns and members of State legislatures, a vast literature, and single Socialist papers with subscription lists running up into the hundreds of thousands. In 1896, 36,000 votes were cast for the Socialist candidate for president; in 1900, nearly 200,000. And the United States, young as it is, is ripening rapidly, and the Socialists claim, according to the materialistic conception of history, that the United States will be the first country in the world wherein the toilers will capture the political machinery and expropriate the bourgeoisie.

But the Socialist and labor movements have recently entered upon a new phase. There has been a remarkable change in attitude on both sides. For a long time the labor unions refrained from going in for political action. On the other hand, the Socialists claimed that without political action labor was utterly powerless. And because of this there was much ill feeling between them, even open hostilities, and no concerted action. But now the Socialists grant that the labor movement has held up wages and decreased the hours of labor, and the labor unions find that political action is absolutely necessary. To-day both parties have drawn closely together in the common fight. In the United States this friendly feeling grows. The Socialist papers espouse the cause of labor, and the unions have opened their ears once more to the wiles of the Socialists. They are all leavened with Socialist workmen, "boring from within," and many of their leaders have already succumbed to the inevitable. In England, where class consciousness is more developed, the name "Unionism" has been replaced by "The New Unionism," the main object of which is "to capture existing social structures in the interests of the wage earners." There the Socialist, trade union, and other working class organizations are beginning to co-operate in securing the return of representatives to the House of Commons. And in France, where the city councils and mayors of Marseilles and Monteau-

les-Mines are Socialistic, thousands of francs were voted for the aid of the unions in the recent great strikes.

For centuries the world has been preparing for the coming of the common man. And the period of preparation virtually past, labor, conscious of itself and its desires, has begun a definite movement toward solidarity. It believes the time is not far distant when the historian will speak not only of the dark ages of feudalism, but also of the dark ages of capitalism. And labor sincerely believes itself justified in this by the terrible indictment it brings against capitalistic society. In the face of its enormous wealth, capitalistic society forfeits its right to existence when it permits wide-spread, bestial poverty. The philosophy of the survival of the fittest does not soothe the class-conscious worker when he learns through his class literature that among the Italian pants-finishers of Chicago* the average weekly wage is \$1.31, and the average number of weeks employed in the year is 27.85. Likewise when he reads:* "Every room in these reeking tenements houses a family or two. In one room a missionary found a man ill with smallpox, his wife just recovering from her confinement, and the children running about half naked and covered with dirt. Here are seven people living in one under-ground kitchen, and a little dead child lying in the same room. Here live a widow and her six children, two of whom are ill with scarlet fever. In another, nine brothers and sisters from twenty-nine years of age downward, live, eat, and sleep together." And likewise, when he reads:** "When one man fifty years old, who has worked all his life, is compelled to beg a little money to bury his dead baby, and another man fifty years old can give ten million dollars to enable his daughter to live in luxury and bolster up a decaying foreign aristocracy, do you see nothing amiss?"

And on the other hand, the class-conscious worker reads the statistics of the wealthy classes, knows what their incomes are, and just how they get them. True, down all the past he has known his own material misery and the material comfort of the dominant classes, and often has this knowledge led him to intemperate acts and unwise rebellion. But to-day, and for the first time, because both society and he have evolved, he is beginning to see a possible way out. His ears are opening to the vast propaganda of Socialism, the passionate gospel of the dispossessed. But it does not inculcate a turning back. The way through is the way out, he understands, and with this in mind he draws up the program.

*From figures presented by Miss Nellie Mason Auteon in the "American Journal of Sociology," and copied extensively by the trade union and socialist press.

**"The Bitter Cry of Outcast London."

**An item from the "Social Democratic Herald." Hundreds of these items, culled from current happenings, are published weekly in the papers of the workers.

It is quite simple, this program. Instead of struggling against forces, the plan is to work with forces. Everything is moving in his direction, toward the day when he will take charge. The trust? Ah, no. Unlike the trembling middle-class man and the small capitalist, he sees nothing to be affrighted at. He likes the trust. He exults in the trust, for it is largely doing the task for him. It socializes production; this done, there remains nothing for him to do but socialize distribution, and all is accomplished. The trust? "It organizes industry on an enormous, labor-saving scale, and abolishes childish, wasteful competition." It is a gigantic object lesson, and it preaches his political economy far more potently than he ever possibly could. He points to it, laughing scornfully in the face of the orthodox economists. "You told me this thing could not be,"* he thunders. "Behold! the thing is!"

He sees competition in the realm of production passing away. When the captains of industry have thoroughly organized production, and got everything running smoothly, it will be very easy for him to eliminate the profits by stepping in and having the thing run for himself. And the captain of industry, if he be good, may be given the privilege of continuing the management on a fair salary. The sixty millions of dividends which the Standard Oil Company annually declares will be distributed among the workers. The same with the great United States Steel Corporation. Schwab is a pretty good man. He knows his business. Very good. Let him become Secretary of the Department of Iron and Steel Industry of the United States. But, since the chief executive of a nation of seventy-odd millions works for fifty thousand a year, Secretary Schwab must expect to have his salary cut accordingly. And not only will the workers take to themselves the profits of national and municipal monopolies, but also the hundreds and billions of revenue which the dominant classes to-day draw from rents, and mines, and factories, and all manner of enterprises.

All this would seem very like a dream, even to the worker, if it were not for the fact that like things have been done before. He points triumphantly to the aristocrat of the eighteenth century, who fought, legislated, governed, and dominated society; but who was shorn of power and displaced by the rising bourgeoisie. Ay, the thing was done, he holds. And it shall be done again, but this time it is the proletariat who does the shearing. Sociology has taught him that m-i-g-h-t spells "right." Every society has been ruled by classes, and the classes have ruled by sheer strength, and have been overthrown by sheer strength. The bourgeoisie, because they were the stronger, dragged down the nobility of the sword;

*Karl Marx, the great socialist, worked out the trust development forty years ago, for which he was laughed at by the orthodox economists.

and the proletariat, because it is the strongest of all, can and will drag down the bourgeoisie.

And in that day, for better or worse, the common man becomes the master—for better, he believes. It is his intention to make the sum of human happiness far greater. No man shall work for a bare living wage, which is degradation. Every man will have work to do, and will be paid exceeding well for doing it. There shall be no slum classes, no beggars. Nor shall there be hundreds of thousands of men and women condemned, for economic reasons, to lives of celibacy or sexual infertility. Every man shall be able to marry, to live in healthy, comfortable quarters, and to have all he wants to eat as many times a day as he wishes. There shall no longer be a life and death struggle for food and shelter. The old heartless law of development shall be annulled.

All of which is very good and very fine. And when these things have come to pass, as they inevitably will, what then? Of old, by virtue of their weakness and inefficiency in the struggle for food and shelter, the race was purged of its weak and inefficient members. But this will no longer obtain. Under the new order the weak and the progeny of the weak will have a chance for survival equal to that of the strong and the progeny of the strong. This being so, the premium upon strength will have been withdrawn, and on the face of it the average strength of each generation, instead of continuing to rise, will begin to decline. And if the strength of the race thus begins to decline, is it not plausible that the race will be displaced by other races yet rising in strength under the old law of development?

This, in turn, is nothing new. Time and again, in the struggles of the classes in past societies, it has been exemplified, and it is so exemplified to-day. For the old law, when working for development, after insuring a better chance for survival to the strong, only insured a better chance to the progeny of the strong during that period which lies between conception and full maturity. After maturity, the progeny of the strong had also to enter the struggle and succeed in order to perpetuate the strength. In the genesis of the old French nobility, for instance, the strongest became the founders of the dominant class. This class gradually built up an institution in society, which, especially in its latter days, permitted the weak to survive and to propagate weakness. Consequently, this class grew weaker and weaker. In England, on the contrary, the institution of aristocracy was so different that the younger sons were forced to shift for themselves, "To win to hearth and saddle of their own." Also, there was much intermarriage with the classes lower in the social scale, and with those classes nearer the soil. And in these classes the struggle for food

and shelter was keen, and it is patent that it was the strong ones among them who were chosen for translation into the nobility for breeding purposes. Constantly revived, the English nobility was thus naturally more virile than the French. And in society to-day the progeny of the captains of industry tends to grow weaker and weaker, and are largely preserved by the social institutions which prevent them from being forced into the struggle for food and shelter.

And likewise, when the common man's day will have arrived, the new social institutions of that day will prevent the weeding out of weakness and inefficiency. All, the weak and the strong, will have an equal chance for procreation. And the progeny of all, of the weak as well as the strong, will have an equal chance for survival. This being so, and if no new effective law of development be put into operation, then progress must cease. And not only progress, for there is high probability that deterioration would set in. It is a pregnant problem. What will be the nature of this new and most necessary law of development? Can the common man pause long enough from his undermining labors to answer? Since he is bent upon dragging down the bourgeoisie and reconstructing society, can he so reconstruct that a premium, in some unguessed way or other, will still be laid upon the strong and efficient so that the human type will continue to develop? Can the common man, or the uncommon men who are allied with him, devise such a law? Or have they already devised one? And if so, what is it? The answer rests with the common man. Dare he answer?
Jack London.

The Anthracite Coal Strike.

There is only one issue in the present struggle between the anthracite coal miners and the mine and railroad owners. That issue is the right to organize. There were other issues when the strike began—wages, hours, dockage, weighing, etc., but they have all been subordinated to this one. The coal trust wants to get rid of the union; the miners want to preserve it. No other question will be settled, or will even be considered, until this one is disposed of: The right of the miners to organize—that is, the issue. The mine owners refuse to arbitrate because that will mean recognizing the union. This they will not do, unless forced to it. The miners, having exhausted every other means, say they will compel recognition.

In order to fully understand how much the preservation or the destruction of the miners' union means to both sides, one has to be right on the ground and hear direct testimony. For twelve years, following upon the failure of the Hazleton and Panther Creek Valley strike in 1887, there were practically no unions in the anthracite region. Strikes broke out spasmodically, but were soon crushed. Lattimer became famous through one of these in 1897. The operators had everything their own way, and that way was simply one of extortion and oppression. There are no gentler names for it—and these are too mild. The miners were discouraged, cowed and spiritless. Those among them who tried, secretly or openly, to organize were "spotted" and blacklisted out of the region. I met several such men, who had returned after the strike of 1900. During this time the mine owners were organizing. Untrammelled by any resistance from their employes, they had free scope to fight one another in the market. Inevitably combination resulted. Small owners were wiped out or absorbed, until now the coal trust controls the anthracite output, the transportation facilities and dictates prices to the consumer. There are individual operators, but they are dependent, more or less, upon the trust, and their position makes them even harder task masters than the trust companies.

In 1899 the Vanticoke miners succeeded in organizing, and in winning a strike which lasted five months. Wages were increased, docking regulated, hours reduced and several minor grievances adjusted. This victory awoke the miners of the whole region. A clamor for organization arose from various quarters. President Mitchell answered the cry by sending "Mother" Jones and other organizers into the field. They worked all winter. Every corner of the region was invaded. The capitalists fought them tooth and

nail. At some places the miners themselves, goaded on by their bosses, mobbed and jeered the agitators. There are exciting stories told of those time, but this is not the place to tell them.

Out of those feverish days and nights of dangerous and difficult work came the strike of 1900. Not all the miners responded immediately to the call. Persuasion was required to get some, exhibition of numbers to get others. After six stormy weeks the strike was settled. It was won, whether politics had anything to do with it or not. True, the union was not directly recognized, but it was established. And that was the main point.

From that time, organization spread and strengthened. Every mine in the region has its local and the districts are well organized. Last year, when the mine owners refused to consider the miners' demands, a strike was avoided through the advice of President Mitchell. He counseled peace, told the men they were not ready to strike, the organization was not compact enough and that they lacked resources. They should accept the situation and prepare for decisive action later. The advice was taken. The men continued to organize and they did prepare. And the present strike is the result.

There can be no doubt that the capitalists really wish to destroy the union—just as ardently as the miners desire to preserve it. With many of the miners this desire amounts virtually to a passion. This has to be seen to be understood. It arises from the changed conditions prevailing since 1900. Not that wages, hours or docking have materially changed, although some advantages have been gained. The men acknowledge that the operators are able, in divers ways, to circumvent and evade rules and agreements. But the miners have more liberty than ever before. From one end of the region to the other this is the one thing they harp upon. They have been able to force consideration where before they were treated with contempt. Formerly, if a man complained, he was ignored or insulted. If he complained again, he was told he "could bring his tools out if he didn't like it."

Things have been different during the past two years. There has been more freedom, more independence. Local unions can send a committee to the boss now and have that committee received courteously, at least, where before its members would have been discharged. Petty exactions have been wiped out, irritating grievances remedied. And having tasted a mite of freedom, the miners want more of it. They are determined not to surrender their newly gained privileges without a bitter struggle.

Nevertheless, the existing situation would have been impossible if it had not been for the confidence felt in John Mitchell. Whatever opinion Socialists may hold of his policy, the miners believe in him, radical and conservative alike. And yet Mitchell

opposed the strike. It was declared over his vigorous protests, for Mitchell is extremely cautious and naturally conservative. At the Hazleton convention he spoke at length against the strike, and then, when the resolution was carried, the delegates cheered him until they were hoarse and he shed tears. Those who witnessed it say that no more dramatic scene has occurred in the history of the American labor movement.

In view of this, Mitchell occupies a decidedly interesting position, and we might well ask: What is the secret of his hold upon his people? He was unknown to the anthracite miners four years ago. He seldom goes out among them, remaining entirely in his headquarters. He is very reserved and apparently shuns publicity. His reticence makes him the despair of the reporters, who, nevertheless, respect him highly and consider him one of the ablest public men in America. Every utterance is well weighed, every statement issued carefully considered in company with his colleagues, with whom he is in perfect harmony.

Mitchell's success of two years ago is, of course, largely responsible for his popularity. Still, such a man was necessary at this time. Some one the miners believed in, whom they could trust their interests with. They are loyal to their union, because they believe John Mitchell is loyal to them. They know he is no orator, that he is still young and that necessarily he is surrounded by temptations. But they believe in his honesty, his ability and his intentions, and they feel secure. The only serious criticism I heard of President Mitchell was about the thirty days' armistice proposed by the Civic Federation and accepted by Mitchell and his colleagues. The operators violated an agreement and stocked coal during the thirty days. Even then, Mitchell is not blamed but the Civic Federation is damned and doomed.

The business men of the region are not with the strikers. There are exceptions, here and there, mostly in the smaller towns. In the cities the merchants seem unable to understand the conditions of the miners or the necessity for organization. Apparently, they can imagine no other lot for the miners than that which obtained for years before the union appeared. They only know that then there were no strikes and the men worked steadily. Now business is dead, bills are hard to meet, goods are piled upon the shelf. They want the strike settled in some way. If the miners lose—thank God, it will be all over! If they win—well, the union will still be here, and won't that mean more strikes?

Then the miners' boycott, endorsed and carried on by other workmen, is exceedingly troublesome. Its necessity or meaning is entirely lost to the merchants. They are blind to everything but that their business is interfered with. The question of justice for the miner, good conditions, restriction of docking, shorter

hours, or even higher wages, never illumines their mental horizon. So, encouraged and assisted by the trust emissaries, they join "Citizen's Alliances" which attempt to prosecute boycotters and "disturbers of the peace." These "Alliances" have had strikers arrested and prosecuted upon charges which, at any other time, would be thrown out of court, but they have never moved toward the apprehension of drunken and riotous deputies or the conviction of the coal and iron police who shed the only blood spilled so far in the strike.

Membership in the Alliance is usually kept a secret. Only a few dare reveal themselves in connection therewith, and these few are generally broken down politicians, lawyers or professional men. The merchants keep discreetly in the background, for they know that, won or lost, they will be remembered when the strike is over. So they confine their activities to giving money and attending meetings, which are held in secret. Only to some one whom they believe to be in sympathy with themselves, will they acknowledge their hatred of the union and display their indifference to the miners' grievances.

There is a gubernatorial election in Pennsylvania this year and the politicians have to be careful. So have the papers, for election day is not so far away that the workingmen may forget. It happens, therefore, that the politicians are scarce in the strike field, and the papers, with very few exceptions, have done nothing but give advice or scold. The politicians heard of are prolific of schemes how to settle the strike, but they are careful not to be seen too much among the strikers.

The Republican Governor, Mr. Stone, sat up nights when the strike started signing commissions for coal and iron police to serve the companies. When the Republican convention met at Harrisburg, Matt. Quay openly bought up the delegates instructed for Mr. Elkin and had Pennypacker nominated. As Quay had Stone elected Governor, the miners, with their usual guilelessness, turned towards the Democratic party to see whom it would nominate and what it would offer to do for them. They were rewarded by seeing ex-Gov. Pattison nominated through the assistance of Mr. Guffey, Standard Oil magnate, who is the Quay of the Pennsylvania Democracy. Pattison has been hated by the workmen ever since 1892, when he sent the troops to Homestead and broke the famous strike. It was most encouraging to note that this act of Pattison's is vividly remembered by the workmen throughout the State. Both old party conventions gave forth no sign of sympathy for the miners.

To further accentuate the political situation it should be noted that the officeholders, constables, squires, sheriffs, burgesses, judges, on up to Governor, have uniformly displayed only antag-

onism to the strikers. Except in conspicuously rare instances, the trust, in the various localities, has had the powers of government used in its favor. Wherever a man attempted to act with the miners, his efforts have been nullified by the actions of others. Party lines are obliterated to serving the capitalists.

This somewhat lengthy and yet incomplete explanation of the strike situation has been necessary in order that outsiders can understand why the Socialist agitators received such a warm welcome in the strike region. We came with a new message to the strikers and they heard us gladly. Thrown into the position of fighting simply to save the union that had protected them for two years, harassed and antagonized by the business men whom they had formerly believed their friends, deserted and deceived by the politicians who had always proclaimed themselves their champions, misrepresented and discouraged by the papers they had always supported, they were ready to listen to those who came and spoke the truth. In my experience I have never seen men who listened so eagerly and with such unfeigned enthusiasm to the Socialist presentation of the situation as did these strikers.

But the way had been prepared for us. "Mother" Jones had not been through the region for nothing. Everywhere she had left a trail of Socialist books and papers behind her. Few of the officials but had subscribed for a paper, and many of the miners received one she had subscribed for for them. And "Mother" Jones' name is a talisman that opens the hearts of the anthracite miners to any Socialist that comes to educate and not abuse.

Then National Secretary Greenbaum's "strike bulletins," following upon his messages of friendship to the miners' conventions, had also familiarized the name of the Socialist Party. These bulletins were much appreciated and made a good impression.

It did not take long, therefore, for the Socialist agitators to secure a hearing. Nothing could more emphasize the different effect produced by the Socialist Labor Party tactics and those of the Socialist Party than the treatment accorded our representatives. Wherever I went in the region I heard stories of how the S. L. P. agitators had made themselves obnoxious by their attacks upon the union and their efforts to disorganize the men. It sometimes became necessary to explain the difference in the parties to enquirers who classed all Socialists as "union wreckers."

I think the members of the Socialist Party are justified in believing that the presence of their representatives in the field was beneficial to the strike and the miners' union. We preached the necessity of Solidarity and explained the industrial situation so that the miners could not help but become imbued with an increased faith in themselves. They were not slow to acknowledge this, and to show their approval of what we said. It became a

very easy matter to get up a meeting for a Socialist speaker and, in some cases, men were known to walk several miles to hear us. The Socialists presented the case with a force and clearness that went home and made, I am sure, a lasting impression, especially as the situation provided all the necessary features for Socialist arguments of unlimited length.

There was no antagonism to the Socialists exhibited by any of the officials. On the contrary, there was an evident desire to allow us to be heard, and local officials gave us much assistance. Personally I received a letter from President Mitchell introducing me to the locals, which, as representative of the "Worker," was of great help to me. I did not have to use the letter to get up meetings. Just as soon as it was learned I was a Socialist and "all right," meetings were arranged for me. There was no danger of not having anything to do.

Wherever Vail, Spargo, Geiger and Collins had spoken, the same encomiums of their work were heard. We had a clear field, for none of the capitalist party politicians were in sight, and the miners were in the mood for the truth. Collins couldn't begin to organize locals fast enough, and he'll probably never do harder or better work again. Fortunately, we had comrades at Carbondale and Wilkesbarre, who took advantage of every opportunity presented.

Two things are to be regretted. First, that more agitators could not be kept in the field, and second, that more literature and better facilities for handling it could not be provided. I was never more impressed with the necessity of a well-formed, efficiently conducted Socialist organization. The national and State officials of the party did their utmost, but their hands were tied for lack of funds. I am of the opinion that half a dozen good Socialist agitators, speaking different languages, following each other through the region, would do more toward winning the strike than all the money the Socialist Party can give to a strike relief fund.

The demand for literature cannot begin to be filled. The miners are reading and discussing what they read as never before. Such an opportunity to reach a large number of workingmen so receptive and hungry for knowledge will seldom be presented again. As it is, we can feel that not only have we done our utmost to propagate Socialism, but we have also inculcated into the hearts and minds of thousands of workingmen the true spirit of the class struggle and some conception of the prevailing industrial phenomena.

A final word about the strike itself. That the conditions around the mines justify organization goes without saying. Nevertheless, I believe these conditions might have been endured a while longer if tyranny had not been exercised to such an extent.

e continually insulted and reviled when seeking redress, to rsed by the boss and subjected to his open contempt, to be ed by the employer when seeking recognition—this was than the miners could stand forever. The union has of- them the only medium of expression for their grievances, nly form of protection from the domineering of under bosses he larger tyranny of the operators they have ever had. The : is the harvest of years of arbitrary and selfish corporate ile.

/hatever the outcome may be, the fact that the fight is one ervice the right to organize should be of encouragement to xialists. There is one thing also of which I am morally cer- that, even if the strike be lost, the union will not wholly be oyed. It has the elements of permanency in it, for men like to be found in the anthracite region are not conquered by lefeat. The union is there to stay, no matter how this strike result or who the officers may be. The seed of Solidarity is eeply planted to be uprooted and destroyed so easily as the owners wish. And if the Socialists have only succeeded in ing that seed a little deeper, this alone should recompense r any money or energy expended during the strike.

William Mailly.

oston, Mass., July 23, 1902.

Events in Russia.

INTERNATIONAL Socialist Bulletin addressed by the executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau to the Socialistic parties of all countries:

A year ago international Socialism called the attention of the world to the assaults made by Czarism upon science and upon the Russian proletariat.

In spite of the earnest protest of the working class of all nations, in spite of the cries of indignation by the European press called out by this event, despotism still reigns in Russia.

Imprisonment, torture, wholesale slaughter await all those who through their organization or their science are seeking a better social state and are planning the deliverance of the working class.

Recent communications to the Socialist press regarding the bloody repression of May 1, in Russia, are now confirmed by the reports coming from workingmen's organizations, and by others, sent by our comrades, B. Kritschewsky and G. Plekhanoff, Russian delegates to the International Socialist Bureau.

At Wilna, the Cossacks and police agents dispersed the paraders, killed the bearer of the red flag, and made prisoners of thirty-seven workingmen, whom the governor, Von Wahl, ordered to be flogged until they were insensible.

At Kieff, they stripped off the clothes of the young students who were arrested at the close of the demonstrations, and subjected them to the most revolting indignities. Mothers were arrested by wholesale and compelled to give information against their own children.

In the province of Poltava the revolting peasants were taken into the churches, and, after being compelled to hear mass, were flogged until insensible.

In the prisons of Ekaterinoslaw, the political prisoners let themselves die of hunger rather than endure longer the brutal treatment of their guards.

The committee of Ekaterinaslaw of the Social Democratic party of Russia has brought these odious facts to the attention of the public. A "famine revolt" (refusal to take food) has broken

the prison of Bouterki at Moscow in consequence of the treatment inflicted upon political prisoners.

Not less the paraders have been flogged and the peasants off have been tortured as atrociously as those of Poltava.

"בד"ר," or the General Union of Jewish Workers of

Lithuania, of Poland, and of Russia send testimony which completes the record of the proceedings. This is as follows:

"The parade of the 1st of May took place at Wilna as was customary. The police and the Cossacks struck the paraders in the street with their usual ferocity. The bearer of the red flag was abused most ferociously, so that his clothes were cut through and his blood flowed in streams. Some dozens of paraders who were arrested were beaten as they were conducted to police headquarters. But all these savageries were only the prelude to the bloody scenes which were enacted on the next day.

"Already, before the parade, by order of the governor, Von Wahl, bundles of rods had been prepared, soaked in water. On the 2d of May the torture took place in the court of the police commissioner in the presence of a commission of executioners, composed of the governor, Von Wahl; the prefect of police, Nasimoff; the doctor, Michailoff; the commissioners of police, Senitko and Kontchewsky; of Brigadier Martinoff, and the police sergeants, Cybousky and Miloucha. The paraders who had been arrested were called up, one by one. With a cynical irony the governor began by extending a May-day greeting to each prisoner. And here is a surprise for you, he added. "How old are you?" "Forty years." "Give him forty blows." "And you?" "Fifty years." "Give him fifty blows." And so on. One prisoner, more reckless than the others, answered that his age was a million years. They gave him a hundred blows and then, as he had lost consciousness, they brought him to himself by pouring cold water over his head, then made him lie down again to continue the torture.

The doctor was there to determine the number of blows which the tortured man could endure. The governor, Von Wahl, watched that the blows should be given vigorously; if the executioner by chance let fall a blow that was a little too feeble the governor declared that this blow did not count.

"The beating continued until the tortured man lost consciousness; if he proved able to get up on his feet they began again. And to aggravate the shame of the torture they offered the tortured man, after having brought him to consciousness again, a poster on which was found these words: 'Vive le premier mai!' These posters had been distributed the day before the parade by the local committee of the general Union.

"The bearer of the red flag and one other workingman were flogged to death!

"The committee of the 'Bund,' the Socialistic party at Wilna, the Social Democratic party of Poland and of Lithuania, the Labor Committee at Wilna, and the Russian Social Democratic group at Wilna, have put out jointly, with reference to this re-

volting and ignominious torture, 10,000 copies of a proclamation in Russian, in a Jewish jargon, and in Polish, in which it has designated the names of the responsible executioners, and it ends with these words: 'Vengeance shall fall upon each of you and your names shall be accursed forever.'"

The white terror rages in Russia more and more ferociously. The episodes of Wilna are unhappily but one instance a little worse than the others.

International Socialism, profoundly indignant at the atrocities which are daily committed against Russian workers, makes its appeal to public opinion that these abominations be denounced.

Moved with grief, it sends its greeting of solidarity to the Russian workers who, with unexampled heroism, are struggling for their political and economic emancipation.

It is the duty of the Socialist Party of every nation to acquaint people with the abominable wrongs which are being done to the working class of Russia and without delay to raise their protest by such means as they shall think most proper against the Czarism which, in its official discourses, speaks of peace, and which in reality is waging an implacable war against people who demand their right to liberty and to existence.

V. Serwy,
Secretary.

Democracy and Education.

There is no doubt that it has been a wholesome discontent that has produced the progress of the human race. The last two generations of Americans have prided themselves that nowhere did there exist a system of schools that equaled their own. In this they were quite right, for the splendid schools of Germany do not constitute a common school system. With this we have been satisfied, and have failed to recognize that although the only nominal system of common schools in the world is that of the United States, nevertheless we have them only in part; that although the methods of education in some of our schools are good, they are still far from what they should be, and the vast majority of our schools are very poor excuses at the best.

It is commonly believed that our public school system was struck, full-fledged, from the brains of the founders and fathers of the country. In this we are wholly wrong. Our public schools are the result of a long evolution. At most the framers of the Constitution saw no further than that a certain amount of intelligence is necessary for any self-governing people. In its early days the common school system met with fierce opposition. The old question was raised, "Should children be educated at the public expense?" The methods of the dame schools of England had been transplanted to America. Alongside the public schools of New England were founded private schools and academies. To these latter were sent the children of the well-to-do. Gradually the public schools became little more than charity schools, and in 1835 a public school system was still a thing of the future.

About this time Horace Mann, one whose name is familiar to every student of education, was asked to set on foot a move to change this condition of affairs. His struggles with the private schools and academies and the body of citizens themselves were long and severe. Not until 1840 did the State of Massachusetts, the leader in the matter, possess a common school system. Our educational system, therefore, has been the outgrowth of necessity. To presume that it has reached its ideal is absurd. It is at present in a state of revolution.

It is usually supposed that the American people are the most intelligent to be found. Again we are right. Yet the statistics collected by the Commissioner of Education reveal some startling facts. There are to-day in the United States about 22,000,000 children of school age. Of these but 16,000,000 are enrolled in the elementary and secondary schools—that is, the grade and high schools. Nearly 6,000,000 children are receiving practically no

education.. Again, of these 16,000,000, but 650,000 ever enter the high school, and but 158,000 ever attend any college, university, or professional school.

Again, the average schooling per individual in the United States is but four school years. We may leave it to any man or woman of intelligence to estimate how much can be accomplished in four years. A knowledge of the three R's constitutes the limit of the education of a large part of the American citizens.

The cause for this condition of things is entirely an economic one. Remembering that there are some individuals who attend school eight, twelve, sixteen—yes, twenty years and more, how is it that this average is so low? There are some children who receive little or no education. These belong to one class, the laboring class. In every large city over and over again the teacher finds the children dropping out of school at 10 and 12 years of age, even in States where compulsory school laws exist. They help to become the bread winners of the family.

In South Carolina, where no compulsory school law exists, they enter the mills at 5 and 6 years. The average length of their lives in the mills is four years. The teachers in the night schools for these little ones say that they do not try to teach them. It is useless. They only endeavor to keep their minds alive by some form of amusement.

In every large city the teacher meets a double difficulty. The children come so poorly clad in winter and with so little food that there is no red blood in their bodies. They cannot be taught. More than this, children of 6 and 8 years are found doing from two to six hours work every day out of school to help keep the family. The same conditions exist in the country. The country boy seldom attends school in the summer after he is 12 years of age, and usually drops out at 14 or 15. The attendance of the girls is little better. This low average is not by any means all due to the ignorant foreign population in the cities, as is often presumed. Nowhere does the average go lower than among the whites of the South.

What, it will be asked, is the cause of all this? Some will answer, It is the fault of individual parents who have not been saving, careful, or temperate enough. A condition found to prevail to such an extent and in one economic class points to other than an individual cause. There is an underlying cause for all this: Economic conditions over which the individuals have been helpless have been the great fundamental reason.

Any examination of any historical period shows that the closest relation has existed between the economic condition of a people or class, and their average intelligence. Man's economic activity began with the procuring of food. Clothing and shelter then be-

came necessary. Thus his wants have multiplied and grown more complex, and constantly he has sought to lessen the amount of his own manual labor necessary to supply these wants. Had he been less ingenious and contented himself with supplying his needs with bare hand labor his advance and cultivation would have been impossible. Tools, domestic animals or other human labor were substituted. As an individual or class gained economic supremacy it happened that two persons, at least, were occupied with mechanical work, so that a third person might enjoy the fortunate condition of not needing to engage in such work. It was the slave labor of Greece that made possible its intellectual supremacy in ancient times. These slaves were the machines, and a vast number of them were requisite for the creation and maintenance of one philosopher. Education was the possession of the aristocracy. It was a disgrace for a free Greek to perform manual labor.

From the earliest times those who possessed certain advantages economically, such as the owning of herds, or lands, or tools, have, on account of this, freed themselves from manual labor and shifted it on to the shoulders of other human beings, and slavery resulted. A leisure class that could devote itself to intellectual culture and scientific advance, who possessed the things with which other men must work, has thus, from the beginning of civilization, stood opposite to a propertyless class that performed the menial labor of the world. Wherever human beings have not been plentiful enough to supply these wants, inventive genius has sought the aid of brute force or inanimate machines. Too often to-day the college professor, the young collegiate, or even the high school graduate looks in contempt at the farm or factory laborer, with dirty, begrimed face, hardened hands and bent form. He never stops to consider that his immaculate shirt front and soft hands are only possible for him because others plow and weave, dig in the mines and cross the sea to provide the world with food, shelter and clothing. We do not in any way claim that the labor of the one is more important than that of the other. Both are alike necessary, and must be done. What we would have is no such complete confining of intellectual work to one part of society and manual labor to another.

As pointed out in a recent United States educational report the keeping of any body of laborers at the lowest point intellectually results in the destruction of their inventive power, and is a menace to any democratic form of government. In Eastern Germany, where cheap labor is plentiful, and the incentive to invent labor-saving machinery has been nil, agriculture is at a low stage of development. Among the western farmers, where laborers are scarce, and devices to lessen the amount of the human part of labor are necessary, there is a far higher average of intelligence, and

the work has, wherever possible, been shifted to domestic animals and machinery.

Now, this represents two tendencies noticeable in society to-day. Where labor is plentiful, and especially among an agricultural people, popular education is underestimated. In the Prussian House of Deputies, where the farm laborers of Galacia were pointed to as the ideal workmen, it was said by members of the land-holding class: "The people of whom one-half can hardly read or write think of nothing save their work and wages. They are the most respectable people in the world." Another said: "I need three oxen for my plow, and if the one behind the plow can call out 'Gee' and 'Whoa' at the right time nothing more is necessary." Again, "No education is necessary for gathering potatoes." Perhaps not, but it is a little hard for the laborer to be classed quite so openly with the brute animal he works with, and by the very class that owes all its superior intelligence to his labor.

In many of the industries it is found that a greater amount of intelligence is an advantage to the employer. In these technical education is favored. Such an education is by no means ideal. It is confined to one narrow line of industry alone, and is calculated not to make broader, more intelligent men, but more valuable workers. More than this, skilled labor has heretofore been well paid. To-day we have a curious phenomenon. The trained engineer, the electrician, the pharmacist and lawyer find that they can obtain no more than the skilled metal- or wood-workers. The labor market is over-crowded. The wages of the technical and professional workers go down accordingly. That technical education should be emphasized at this time is quite as we should expect. The industrial character of the period demands it. It has displaced the purely classical education.

Any examination of education shows at once that it has at all times borne the mark of its time and place. Perhaps nothing will illustrate this better than an example taken from the history of education in Germany. Frederick the Great was the creator of Prussia. He saw that to make his people powerful among the nations of Europe he must have artisans able to provide for the wants of his people at home, as well as soldiers to fight his battles abroad. To train these he founded an industrial school in 1735, and sought to do away with the old quantity education that is characterized by the learning of so many lines and pages and per cent. examinations, Fichte persuaded William III. to send across the mountains to Switzerland and inquire about and learn the methods of Pestalozzi, who was working a revolution in education by bringing the children about him and teaching them from nature. This was done, and the schools of Prussia became the best in the world.

Then came the French Revolution. "The common people have begun to think," said the Prussian rulers together with the other rulers of Europe. We must do away with this quality education that will train them in intelligence, and return to our schools the old method of page learning. Napoleon, born of the French Revolution, swept over Europe, and Prussia came under his power. The question arose as to the cause of their weakness and the remedy. The new minister of education advised a return to the methods of Pestalozzi,—the work from Nature and of investigation. Quality education was returned, and Froebel's kindergartens were opened. In 1848 came another period of unrest, and revolution, and once more the Germans turned to the study of the catechism and all work of investigation was abolished. The schools of Froebel and the Normal of Pestalozzi were closed. It was no less a person than Prince Bismarck who said that an educated working-class was a menace to any nation. To any nation founded upon the rule of the few over the many, it is a menace.

It might be well here to give a word of explanation of these terms "quality" and "quantity" education. The first we have already characterized. It is the method that prevails now in our public schools. It consists of the cramming system, the bare gathering of facts. The quality method aims to foster the power of self-activity, of choice. All this will be made clearer by going into details as to the present revolution taking place in education. First of all, this revolution is not a thing of itself apart from all else. It is a part of the great change that is taking place in society. As the form of the industrial institutions upon which all other institutions are founded is passing through a period of transition, so in the fields of literature, art, ethics, science and education there is a correspondingly noticeable change. The social organism moves together as one great whole.

A few examples will best illustrate this change, the two methods of education, and the different objects that the two seek to accomplish. I remember distinctly the way in which I was taught the steam engine. A bare diagram was put before me to represent the different parts. I was told, "This is a steam chest. This a piston rod," and so on. As I saw steam engines working from time to time I was quite helpless in identifying the parts, much less could I have handled one. Exactly the same thing was done in the study of electricity or of any mechanical apparatus. Under the new method it is recognized that it is worse than useless to teach from diagrams, that the child must touch and handle, and make the parts, and put them together if he is to know them.

Take the method of teaching arithmetic. I doubt not if you were to go into the nearest school you would still find them teaching the multiplication and addition tables. The new method teaches

the child addition by the process of actually putting together objects, not abstract figures. It teaches multiplication and the other processes of numbers in the same manner.

The average parent, if asked about the progress his boy of ten has made in reading, will reply, "He reads in the fourth reader." That means nothing to the teacher who has gotten out of the old ruts of text-books. Little does he care what is the number of the reader, whether it be four or forty. Reading words in itself is nothing. What we do wish to know is, how much power that boy has gained in making the thought of the printed page his own.

I think the tendency of the new education is becoming plain. It is to produce men and women of broad and rounded manhood and womanhood, having the power of decision and logical independent thought, not mere repeaters of words, parrot-like following some authority,—men and women, who question, investigate search out the truth and know things not words. It emphasizes the training of the body as well as the mind, and would have an individual developed mentally, morally and physically.

Society to-day suffers from two extremes through its division into economic classes. On the one hand is the so-called cultured scholar, with his knowledge confined to books. His training has all been a kind of brain exercise. On the other hand is the farm and factory laborer, often barely able to read and write and keep his accounts, with all his knowledge confined to the machine. The new education would combine these two, brain and hand culture, and thus destroy our one-sided system of education, and produce complete men and women. Under the present social conditions this is impossible.

There is not alone this one-sidedness in the culture of the two great economic classes, but our industrial system produces a pitiful narrowness in the education,—education being understood in its broadest sense—of the members of the different trades in the laboring class. Outside the little bounds of his own trade the workman knows little or nothing. For example, what does the city born youth know of the processes of plowing, sowing and gathering the grain? Or the farmer, what does he know of the wonderful machinery in the rooms, for example, of a city newspaper, the linotype and the great Hoe presses, or the complex machines of a cotton or woolen factory?

Still further. More and more to-day, especially in times of fierce economic struggle, a technical education is emphasized at the expense of general education in certain trades. This gives us a one-sidedness and narrowness again born of our present system. We have seen people take a child that showed marked talent for music, put it at the piano constantly, neglect any other training, physical or mental, and then wonder why at eighteen or

twenty it made no further progress, and failed to turn out the prodigy they expected. It is plain enough to see why. The child had nothing on which to work, no broad foundation of culture that would enable it to appreciate the good and the beautiful as it grew older.

"Specialize" is the watchword of the day. All well and good. But remember that if you have not first laid a foundation in the form of a good general education your specialist may know all about a certain beetle or trade, but he has no power to grasp or enjoy the other phases of civilization. One writer has well said "Special education, without a general education, is like a house without a foundation."

And now one word as to school discipline. In your school days and mine the ideal schoolroom was, and no doubt to-day, from necessity, still is, the one in which the least noise is heard, where communication is unknown. Our present school organization requires this. The teacher with thirty or fifty children to cram facts into can do nothing else. The new education recognizes that childhood is a time of activity, that to force children to sit six hours in a stupid room is little less than criminal. The new method lays no emphasis on such tomb-like quiet, since the pupil in the model schoolroom is doing things, and learning by doing, not being filled passively, like so many pitchers, with unassimilated matter.

I have gone thus fully into the pedagogical side of the new education, that I might show wherein the present school system will break down, and must be intelligently reconstructed. Also to show that our present system is not the one best fitted for a democratic form of government.

To-day education is used in a woefully narrow sense. It means to the majority of us so many years spent in school or college. Then comes the great "bread and butter problem," the "how to earn a living" question that absorbs the remainder of our lives. One great educator has said: "All of life should be an education." To-day this is impossible. The struggle for existence leaves no time for culture. Yet many of these changes are looked upon as "fads," and if there should come into the average neighborhood a teacher capable of teaching after this method who would, for instance, train the boys and girls in practical chemistry, teach soils, physics, the zoology of insects, and arithmetic by actual objects and measurements, the citizens would be apt to rise up in indignation and put him out, so settled have they become in the old ways.

To-day the knowledge of the world, like the capital of the world, is the monopoly of the few. There is one form of education for the rich, another for the laborer. The laborers believe they are "educated." This is as the ruling class would have it. The

laborers are satisfied, and at the same time kept contented by this "quantity" education, that prevents any free action of their mind. Gradually the ruling class is withdrawing its children from the public schools. Well enough they recognize its defects. The workers are taught, not alone from the lecture platform and through the press, but in the public schools, those things that will best further and maintain the permanency of the present capitalist class.

No form of democracy can long continue where there exists, as there does today, a permanent form of class education. The object of aristocracy has always been the subjugation of the many to the few. Does there exist no aristocracy in the United States to-day? If you do not recognize its existence I shall not undertake to prove it to you. The question of aristocracy has been, how far it is safe to make its laboring class intelligent, and still keep them from thinking for themselves. No monarchy is without class schools. Any feeling of personal rights on the part of the common people is dangerous. They must be prevented from finding the truth.

We all recognize that the industrial changes from 1880 to 1902 have been wonderful. We have seen competition that we, perhaps, began to think was permanent, wellnigh disappear, and monopoly take its place. We must admit that social forms are not lasting; that they are in a constant state of change, and all the signs of the times indicate that the next step in social evolution will see the great producing instruments pass into the hands of the people—collectively owned. Modern inventions have increased the productiveness of human labor a hundred fold. One man with a machine can now do the work of twenty or thirty men in many trades. This great increase of labor-saving machinery should have been the means of releasing a larger and larger part of the population from manual labor and making it possible for them to devote themselves for a part of their time to intellectual work. The menial labor that a multitude of slaves performed if some few were to become philosophers in Greek times, could now be turned over to bands of steel and iron. That this is not done is due to the fact that these machines are privately owned and run for profit. It is the labor-saving machine belonging to the people collectively that will abolish human slavery, free the laborer from constant toil and give him leisure for the culture of his mind.

May Wood Simons.

Socialism and Solidarity.

To inquire whether Socialism and Solidarity have relations between them, and to determine what these relations are,—this is the problem. The question is a delicate one, which may easily enough be answered briefly in the affirmative, but to show the basis for the affirmative answer is not so easy.

In that science, born only yesterday, to which the name of Socialism has been given, everything is still to be created,—method, terminology, data. The figures accumulated by statistics, no matter how laboriously, relate to fugitive facts which can neither be weighed nor measured in the laboratory. The personal equation of error sifts into them to an extent which leads to the most contradictory results. The language of the sociologist fails of scientific precision and each of them forges his own vocabulary. As for the data, they have been realized, to the extent that certain experiments constitute data, in a hostile environment. It is then only the sentiment of truth, the instinct for certainty, the scent of the real path, which are our best guidance in this complex field.

We need first to fix the exact content of the two terms which limit the field that we must survey: First, Socialism. I am one of those who think that Socialism is not, properly speaking, a new doctrine. It is a clearer affirmation of the slow, age-long, universal tendency toward what is better; it is a clearer and more precise expression of the great law of least effort, the only expression which seems established by the multiplicity of the facts which it explains and which it justifies.

To satisfy each day a greater sum of needs with equal effort, or to satisfy with less effort the same or a larger sum of needs, such is certainly the most undeniable social phenomenon. For a long time the law of least effort has been perceived and stated. But in our time it is brought to the eyes of all under forms as wonderful as they are convincing.

The rotary press which pours forth in one hour a torrent of ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty, or thirty thousand papers, folded and counted, while the cylinder press is painfully printing a thousand, and the hand press a hundred, is an admirable symbol of this law.

And the post office, and the railroad, and the steamer! And the electricity which takes the place of gas, carrying light everywhere with brilliant profusion! The invisible word launched across the spaces and caught in its flight like a butterfly on the wing! and the sewing machine, the typewriter, the typesetting machine, the calculating machine, the bicycle and the automobile! One might say that a horde of inventors, like the hordes of barbarians, has

invaded the world and overturned even in its inmost recesses our contemporary life.

Nevertheless, it seems that the effort required from each and every one of the workers has become lamentably multiplied. Every spine has become curved from over-work. Our life carries us away like a whirlwind, and our nerves, scarcely equal to the burdens imposed upon them, are stretched to the breaking point, and the most inconceivable confusion governs the satisfaction of our desires.

Less than ever do these desires seem to be satisfied. They have increased more rapidly than the accelerated means for satisfying them. And the worst of it is that our needs sometimes crowd violently against closed doors of granaries which are creaking under the weight of stored products. The manufacturers complain of stocks which they cannot distribute, and the workers groan and weep because hunger and thirst are strangling them in the garrets of a house in which the lower story is bursting with merchandise and provisions. The contradiction is infamous and would be infernal if the improvement of economic machinery and manual skill must end in exciting new miseries and making the old miseries more intense.

From this contradiction is born the social question, and to this question a response has been given, Socialism.

Nevertheless, ever since it became important to define this response, a thousand doctors have presented themselves and definitions have abounded. Marx, Fourier, Owen, Lassalle, to mention only those who have died, have stated formulas. We recognize integral Socialism, rational Socialism, the Socialism of the platform, State Socialism, communist Socialism, and collectivist Socialism.

Disorder presides over the production, the circulation and the distribution of wealth. Disorder seems to preside also over the hatching of systems and remedies. For one, the social question is a moral one, for another the social question is a question of the stomach; for one it is a political question, for another a question of finance.

But if programs and acts are examined, certain broad lines of argument appear, certain essential ideas come to the surface and we see that one common motive animates the reformers.

The group substituted for the individuals is the thought which inspires all reforms, from the most deadening to the most revolutionary.

To the struggle for life is opposed co-operation for life. Free competition, the pretended mother of harmony, is thenceforth rejected.

Competition has covered our walls with verbose posters, has flooded our houses with lying advertisements, has degraded the press, and has raised adulteration to the position of a world-wide institution. Trusts, combinations and pools have permitted certain millionaires to carve out for themselves empires more vast than those of Tamerlane or Mahomet. In the presence of the barons of finance the barons of feudalism seem like petty pick-pockets. Protectionism and militarism are triumphant; our frontiers bristle with custom houses and threatening fortresses.

Never has the world beheld such a spectacle. The invasions of the Huns and the Normans, the Crusaders and the Mussulmen have been but insignificant skirmishes compared with the gigantic conflict for which the nations have been preparing these thirty years.

After eighteen centuries of Christianity, one century of economic liberty has sufficed to lead up to this work of hate and terror.

Formerly the land covered itself with temples and cathedrals. Henceforth it covers itself with barracks and factories. Hideous and sinister, they rise on the confines of the most exquisite landscapes, among fields where harvests wave as in the fields beyond the mountains, among the torrents and cascades.

And yet these have been the great initiators and through them the better has been born from the worst. They have sifted out the human mass, have fused together the peasants and the city laborers, have brought the common people into the cities and scattered the workers over the fields; they have enlisted men and imposed discipline upon them.

It is due to this mighty army, it is due to this highly developed industry, that the notion of solidarity has penetrated into the most stubborn brains, for without it the work of death and the work of life would be equally impossible of realization; it is the necessary condition of production as well as of destruction.

Inevitably the two concepts, of Solidarity and of Socialism, which grew into consciousness in the thought of the masses at one and the same moment of evolution, were destined to unite and to combine. And it might have been said and has been said that Socialism would be nothing less than solidarity, or that it would not be realized.

Unhappily the idea of Solidarity, like the idea of Socialism, is something impossible to state in a definite formula. The choice of the word intended to designate this idea might indeed raise objections.

Solidarity is a juridical term, and the sense which the jurists have given it has but a distant connection with the sociological

idea that it is called upon to express. To say, in fact, that every debtor for an obligation in solidarity is held alone for the entire debt, apart from his recourse upon his co-debtors, and to say that every creditor for such an obligation has the right to demand for his own profit the entire payment of what is due, apart from the recourse of his co-creditors upon him,—all this explains nothing from the special point of view in which we find ourselves placed. In the social domain no one would require from each of us the execution of the duty imposed upon all, any more than each of us could require from all for his exclusive profit the execution of a duty to be accomplished toward all.

One formula has precisely defined in this regard both the debt with which we are socially charged and the credit to which we are entitled, namely: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Between the notion of solidarity, as it has been formulated by the jurists, and the notion of solidarity as it has been conceived by the teachers of Socialism, there is then a formal contradiction. Where the jurist says all of the debt or all of the credit, the sociologists say: A reduced debt and a relative credit. The notion of social solidarity is manifestly superior to that of juridical solidarity in that it imposes upon a creditor a social debt as a condition of recognizing his social credit. But it is evident that this is not the whole of solidarity as it is stated by the Socialist schools.

The second formula might make it better: "All for one, and one for all." This formula has the advantage of showing the ties which proceed from us to our brothers, as well as the ties which proceed from our brothers to each of us. This formula most emphatically pre-supposes the existence of the group which I indicated as the essential characteristic of all the socialist systems, and it affirms, as I hold, more emphatically still that there is but one human group, and that socially there is but one sole society, humanity.

Nevertheless, the two formulas remain vague and we must turn to deeds and acts in order to grasp fully in what consists solidarity, such as Socialism practises it and demands it. Militant Socialism indeed vehemently sets forth a triple activity, that of the mutual association, the labor union, and the co-operative. Co-operatives, labor unions and mutual associations constitute the regiments of this army and the discipline of this army, and is nothing more or less than Solidarity. No one will contradict me, I think, if I say that this triple activity is in the highest degree social and tending toward Solidarity. I say social intentionally, for

I know the objections that would surely be urged if I were to say Socialist.

With the utmost exactness it would be pointed out to me that the mutual benefit association, the labor union and the co-operative exist and prosper under political forms which are most diverse and that their most imposing successes have been realized without any other ideal than the very realistic and selfish one of satisfying needs which are purely and grossly material.

To all this I agree. I admit it with regret and I must indeed declare that many members of mutual associations, labor unions and co-operatives are attracted to these organizations by nothing less than the pecuniary and personal advantages which they receive from them.

But it is precisely because this is so that it will be to the eternal honor and superiority of Socialism to have affirmed that the triple activity of unions, mutual associations and co-operatives has an educative and suggestive value, that it is merely a mile-stone of the evolution toward a more fraternal organization of human society and that it constitutes the embryonic form of the coming administration of things.

It may be affirmed that it is Socialism under its political form which has discovered and defined the influence toward solidarity exercised by the co-operative, the mutual association, and the union. The Socialist party of Belgium, at least, has affirmed this as well in its declaration of principles as in its economic program. In its declaration of principles it states that the transformation of the capitalistic system into a collectivistic system requires in the moral order the development of altruistic sentiments and the practice of solidarity. In its economic program one and the same paragraph admits the need of recognition of the unions and the reform of the laws regarding mutual relief societies and co-operatives. It would be easy to point out similar declarations in the manifestoes of the Socialist parties of other countries.

It is thus certain that what men of good will have realized in a sporadic fashion Socialism is seeking to co-ordinate in a methodical and organic fashion. By the attraction of its ever increasing mass, by its persistent propaganda in favor of the ideas of altruism and brotherhood, it must inevitably group and it is already grouping within itself the existing organizations into vast federations of a real and conscious solidarity.

It is possible that the word Socialism may be transformed in the course of time into Socialization, and that the word Solidarity may give place to the word Interdependence. It will none the less be true that the aim and end of Socialism will be to realize through all its efforts the maximum of solidarity through the maximum of co-ordination. And we shall see later that the ideal

program of Socialism is nothing but an enlargement and projection into the future of the tendencies now contained in its program of immediate realization.

I have tried to show the origins of the two conceptions, Socialism and Solidarity, which in our time have become conscious, by the effect of a reaction against the abuses and misconceptions of liberty, and I have attempted, however imperfectly, to define these two conceptions. I hope to show still further that if Socialism and Solidarity have been a reaction against liberty, nevertheless they do not lead, as has been erroneously maintained, to the annihilation of liberty.

I said, it is true, that Socialism has for its essential content the substitution of the group for individuals and that Solidarity expresses more especially the mutual subordination of the individuals to each other, the link of creditor to debtor and of debtor to creditor which unites them socially. It might appear that this double union of the group and the link involves hierarchy and authority and is destructive of individual independence.

This view, as I hold, rests on a serious misconception of the proper domain of liberty, as indeed also of equality and of fraternity. Many errors spring from the confusion excited by this celebrated and beautiful republican device. I think, indeed, that the juridical domain is the proper domain of equality, as the economic domain is the proper domain of fraternity, which is nothing but the moral side of Solidarity. Liberty in its turn has for its proper domain the intellectual field.*

In the juridical domain everything is prescription, regulation, order. In the economic domain natural laws impose themselves upon us with an authority that admits of no discussion. We can apply them to our needs, but not evade them. On the contrary, what men have demanded for centuries and justly demanded at the cost of most terrible suffering has been the right to express their opinions by voice or pen, to meet together, to deliberate together in the fullness of their independence. Now this liberty has always been in inverse ratio to the economic power of the ruling class. It is this which the rationalistic Socialists have very happily described as the compressibility of free inquiry.

Under the system of slavery and serfdom the economic power of the head of the family, or of the feudal lord, was almost unlimited. Liberty did not exist, neither for the slave nor for the serf. Under the wage system the ruling class always has at its disposal an exceptional economic power, since liberty of thought

*To avoid any ambiguity it is worth while to observe that if I say the proper domain I do not mean the only domain.

is always restricted and the majority of men in most civilized countries are too often forced into silence or falsity, if they wish to preserve their position and their resources. Too often, also, it is necessary to howl with the wolves. Not until the day when the economic power of the ruling class shall have been reduced to zero will liberty of opinion and of thought be really installed in the world.

The misunderstanding which has produced at once the splendor and the misery of the century just ended has consisted precisely in carrying over the concept of liberty from the intellectual field into the economic. This misunderstanding has tended to stifle the growth of free inquiry, although fortunately to a limited extent, and it has moreover had the effect of perpetrating under the capitalistic form the predatory system of past centuries.

Now to say Socialism and Solidarity means nothing less than the suppression of all economic domination, and consequently, the final liberation of thought. Indeed, on the one hand, the social group such as we have defined it would not be conceivable if it were composed of heterogeneous groups, while, on the other hand, the solidarity realized between the individuals of the social group would not be effective if the action of one alone might counter-balance the action of all or of several.

It is then on the triumph of solidarity, fraternity, and altruism in the economic field that the final triumph of liberty in the intellectual field is conditioned, and we may say the same of the triumph of equality in the juridical field.

As for this triumph of Solidarity, I see no force but Socialism which is capable of assuring it. I know very many of those who hold with the Socialist schools that humanity is marching toward a greater degree of solidarity, but still refuse to align themselves with this extreme opinion, which to many seems subversive. Nevertheless, this conviction of mine seems to follow irresistibly from the Socialist program of immediate realization.

Two fundamental reforms are inscribed upon this program, which are nothing less than the necessary and inevitable extension of the work of the co-operatives and the labor unions, namely, the collective appropriation of property and the social organization of labor.

The appropriation by the commonwealth of natural forces, the soil, instruments of labor and means of production is, in my eyes, nothing less than the hastening of the reform begun by co-operative action. To make all the citizens of the world co-operators in a single co-operative organism, to transform the present predatory society into a co-operative society, such is

certainly the ideal end toward which co-operative action tends. If it were possible to reach this result by mere persuasion and propaganda, Socialism might drop from its program its most essential demand. But who can think seriously of the co-operators even of a single country, with all their efforts, becoming joint owners of all the wealth of that country?*

It would, moreover, be necessary that all the citizens of this country acquiesce in becoming voluntarily members of the national co-operative in order that a really co-operative appropriation be realized through the simple play of present social forces. If co-operation is really that form of the consumption and production of wealth which tends to Solidarity, would it not be absurd to refuse to hasten its final installation? This is the mission assigned to Socialism, and to Socialism alone.

The social organization of labor again is, in turn, nothing but the necessary and inevitable outcome of the action of trade unions. Even now the union has an influence over this organization, since its principal end is to obtain the regulation of wages, of the hours of labor, and the limitation of the selection and enlistment of laborers. Already it often happens that the union manages a school of apprenticeship and a shop for those out of work. But how painfully this labor is accomplished, at the cost of how many strikes and miscalculations! Evidently in a society without employers it will be to the union inevitably by the nature of things that all trade regulation must be referred. Through the fact that it would enroll all the laborers of a given trade, united into an autonomous group, it would become the true employer of this trade, providing for the distribution of labor and the enlistment of the laborers. Solidarity would show itself in such groups not so much, as is now the case, by pecuniary sacrifices made by each of the trade unionists to guarantee the defense of the wages and the leisure hours of his brother laborers, as by the strict payment of the debt of labor imposed upon all according to their abilities and which all will make it a veritable point of honor to discharge completely.

To this question of the social organization of labor is directly linked a reform no less fundamental to which Socialism attaches equal importance. I refer to universal and complete education. The only method of defining what are the aptitudes belonging to each individual and of determining thus what debt he owes to society, the only means of putting him in a situation to discharge this debt and to apply his aptitudes, is evidently to impart to him in the greatest measure possible the knowledge of all fields in

*To speak only of Belgium. I may estimate the wealth accumulated by the co-operators there at about \$600,000. The total wealth of this country is estimated at \$6,000,000,000. This disproportion between the means and the end is manifest enough, especially if we consider that it required twenty years at least for the Belgian co-operators to realize their modest accumulations.

which the activity of men is exercised. On the other hand in a social organization where discussion among citizens on the subject of the satisfaction of their highly diversified needs shall be the permanently established practice, it will be indispensable that this discussion be rapid and practical and that each one take part in the debates with a clear conception of the questions to be solved. Again, greater or less productivity of each individual will be to a great extent conditioned by the greater or less intelligence with which each shall accomplish his task. Now, in a social organization which, conformably to the law of least effort, shall carry division of labor to the maximum, the productivity of each of the laborers will have a particularly important bearing upon the collective result of production. It is especially from this point of view that the solidarity of human efforts will assert itself with a marked intensity.

As for the action of the mutual associations, it also finds its extension and its amplification in compulsory and universal insurance, such as is demanded by the Socialist programs, and its final expression will be in the distribution of the products of labor according to the needs of each one. Compulsory insurance is a mutual benefit association extended to cover all the risks of life and applied to all the citizens from their first conception to their last breath. Limited at present through various laws to special risks, and left by others to private initiative, the mutual benefit association establishes a bond of solidarity only among participants especially threatened by dangers, accidents and diseases, the effects of which it seeks to remedy or alleviate. True human Solidarity will not be realized in this field until all men carry each his part of the disabilities and the sufferings which fall upon their fellow citizens. The burden will thus be wonderfully lightened for those who now carry it by themselves.

Again, the social aspect of hygiene and its close relation to Solidarity will appear more clearly to the eyes of all.

Even now social hygiene becomes obligatory through the perils to which each of us is exposed by reason of the diseases which others may transmit to him. But the necessity of hygiene will be far more completely felt when it comes to bear directly upon the productivity of labor and upon the cost of the insurance charge imposed upon all as well as upon the quota of the necessities which have to be set aside for the benefit of those incapacitated for labor through disease, with a corresponding detriment to the laborers. It is thus with sound forethought that most Socialist programs look forward to profound modifications in the performance of all public service pertaining to the food of children, the housing of families, to sanitary precautions and to the treatment of diseases.

Thus, from whatever point of view we take, Socialism stands for human Solidarity. It is not alone in this demand, but it is alone in proclaiming Solidarity as the directing idea of all its aspirations, in glorifying it in every undertaking, in hailing it as a final liberator, which shall break down all barriers between classes, between races, between nations.

And that is why it is to Socialism that all those are turning whose souls are generous and brotherly, all those who are women and men of good will. Socialism has this singular virtue, of bringing to its cause adherents who have grown more numerous, more enthusiastic, more determined, in spite of the quarrels of schools and of the disputes of persons. It has that virtue of attraction which Christianity once possessed and I think that it owes it to that idea of solidarity, of altruism, of brotherhood to which humanity has been aspiring through all the centuries. And to sum up all my thought, I will say that if Solidarity is the ideal of Socialism, Socialism is the politics of Solidarity.

H. La Fontaine (Trans. by Chas. H. Kerr.)

Concerning the American Labor Union.

Laramie, Wyo., July 14, 1902.

Mr. A. M. Simons, Chicago, Ill.:

Dear Sir and Comrade—Your editorial "Socialism and the Trades Union Movement" in the July International Socialist Review is before me. After careful perusal I think it quite necessary to point out to you that your view upon the question is rather pessimistic, and your ultimatum somewhat unjust to our position.

I venture to say that a majority of the members of the W. L. U. convention came to Denver with the determination to bring about reconciliation between the A. F. of L. and the W. L. U.

During the days of the convention a strike was in progress in Denver between the building trades and their employers, which was utilized by the A. F. of L. for the most aggressive and extraordinary means to injure the organization of the W. L. U. ever invented by man.

While this was going on a committee was speeding to Denver to make a show at an attempt to reconcile the two organizations. It made the poorest attempt at this anyone could ever have seen; showing plainly that it was not their intention to have us with them (as you very properly surmise), at the same time throwing sand into the eyes of the rest of the labor world, quasi proving that they are sincere.

With the contemptible fight in Denver and the more contemptible farce at conciliation, it turned the stomach of mostly all who before had an appetite for the fruit of peace.

We had to do something, however, to offset the work of ingression upon our territory by the repeated aggression of an unscrupulous competitor, hence we entered the broader field of National work with open visor and name. This latter move was also taken by earnest Socialists in the convention for the purpose of forcing the A. F. of L. to a declaration.

From my observation I could readily discern that nearly all the members of the convention saw the utter uselessness of trades unions without politics independent of present political parties and knowing that the A. F. of L. under Mr. Gompers would never depart from the old, worn-out path of trades unionism, unless forced by just such action as we have taken, there was no other way out of the dilemma.

If Mr. Gompers is to remain at the head of the A. F. of L., as is very likely under their form of organization, even if the majority of the members desire a removal, there must be some way

in forcing the issue with them, and our necessary encroachment may force that issue.

On the other hand, if the A. F. of L. declares in favor of independent political action and Socialism, it is a short step for the A. L. U. to get under cover with them. I fear, however, that such a declaration is a great ways off and not in sight with Mr. Gompers as president.

Some of our greatest (western) thinkers have proclaimed the step of the several organizations in Denver you speak about in the above-mentioned article the most far-reaching labor movement in the history of trades unionism, and unless all signs fail you will agree with them after due consideration and the linement of time.

If the A. L. U. continues the aggressive campaign inaugurated since the close of the convention in Denver there is no doubt that it will be a powerful factor, in the west at least, by the next presidential election, when the Socialists will have tickets in every State west of the Mississippi—and elect some of them.

The Socialists in the conventions had many a hard battle and many a sleepless night to win the members over, and their efforts and intentions should receive more general study and consequent appreciation than can be inferred from your article.

Permit me to remain yours sincerely,

F. W. Ott.

EDITORIAL

Lines of Division in American Socialism.

We have often pointed out, in these columns and elsewhere, the presence of two divergent tendencies now in process of amalgamation into a real American Socialist movement. Just at the present moment the process of union seems to be arousing a little more friction than is actually necessary.

This friction arises largely from the fact of mutual misunderstandings and hence should yield to intelligent study and discussion. This misunderstanding is the more easily possible because the two phases have such different origins, are so widely separated geographically and are made up of such wholly different individuals. One is located in the West, is quite largely agrarian in its origin, comes almost wholly from economic development, and is peculiarly American in its make-up.

The other is almost wholly Eastern (with the exception of some portions of California), is urban, arrived at its conclusions quite largely through direct ideological propaganda, and is still (though rapidly losing this phase) formed mainly from those born in other countries. None of these characteristics carry either credit or blame to the parties or persons concerned, but are nevertheless facts which must be considered in any adequate comprehension of the problem before the Socialists of this country.

Until very recently the Socialist movement in the United States was almost wholly made up of men who had either gained their knowledge of Socialism in another country, or of those who had been converted to an understanding of an ideological system which these European Socialists had brought with them. Little attention was paid by either of these classes to American economic conditions, but much to Marxian economic theories.

These facts account for the almost complete literary barrenness of the American Socialist movement. While some of the ablest thinkers and writers of the German Socialists were among the founders of the movement in this country, there was not a single book or pamphlet produced during the period in which this element reigned that is to-day mentioned in counting up the permanent and valuable literature of the Socialist movement of the world.

The reason for this was that few of these Socialists thought it worthwhile to learn anything of American conditions, or to in any way identify themselves with the real forces of social revolt. Placing themselves upon a theoretical and largely dogmatic philosophical Olympus they looked with disdain upon those who were engaged in the real social struggles. But in thus cutting loose from all reality they were dooming themselves to sterility.

When they wrote of American conditions, as they often did in European periodicals, they quite frequently only showed how little they really knew of the life in which they found themselves. They wrote of America as a sort of transplanted England after the Industrial Revolution, or a Germany in the midst of capitalism. Not one of them ever saw any of the great dynamic facts that were building and creating the economic structures of this nation. None of these many Socialist theoreticians have ever noted what was really the most distinctive and important fact in American history, at least from the Socialist point of view. They never comprehended in the slightest degree the tremendous influence upon our whole social life exercised by the continual presence of a frontier within our geographical and governmental boundaries.

Now and then a Socialist writer has seen far enough in this direction to consider the frontier as a "safety valve" and to predict the terrible things that would happen when that "safety valve" was closed. Indeed, the "safety valve" idea has been decidedly overworked, for the fact is, that with irrigation and a host of other new movements, there is not the slightest sign of its disappearance. In this respect we have also sinned in the past by talking this same nonsense, for which we now humbly ask the reader's pardon. What has happened now, however, is that the frontier, as a geographical expression for a great extent of contiguous territory, has disappeared, and this fact is having some important consequences.

But while some Socialists have seen this one phase of the frontier in an exaggerated form, none of them have seemed to think that this fact helped in any way to determine where the forces of social discontent would naturally be located. This was because they had not realized that in this country the element which in other lands was in continuous revolt against social injustice, had here simply moved on to the frontier, and that therefore it would be where that frontier was last located that social discontent would find its first strong united native expression.

The consequence of this blindness to actual facts is that while the theoretical Socialist is prepared for the present increase of Socialist sentiment among the Eastern trade unionists, and will make almost any sort of a concession to secure their allegiance, he cannot see any reason why there should be any Socialist sentiment in the locality where the last great frontier stage was located, and where even the slightest knowledge of economic conditions would have taught him was really the most prolific ground for Socialist propaganda. This position is accentuated by the facts pointed out above that the Eastern Socialist is himself generally an urban factory worker, while the dwellers on the frontier, whatever may have been their previous occupation, are now mainly small farmers.

So it is that there arises a sharp misunderstanding between these two wings of the movement, between the old and the new, the ideological and the materialistic Socialist; for, strange as it may seem, the fellow with the "clearest cut" materialistic philosophy is very apt to have come to his Socialism ideologically, while the Western outcast of capitalism who comes in strict obedience to the working of that philosophy is very apt to give a sentimental and ideological reason for "the

faith that is in him." This fact adds another to the already large number of misunderstandings and contradictions that threaten to multiply and grow until they menace the solidarity of the American Socialist movement.

The frontiersman has always had the utmost contempt for forms and conventionalities of all kinds. He has been sufficiently class-conscious to recognize that in our present society these forms were not created in the interest of his class. He has also had but little use for the wisdom of the books, and in this, too, it is easy to see a blind class-consciousness of the fact that the literature of to-day is not written from the point of view of the producing class. It is easy to push this idea too far and credit the frontiersman with a clearer comprehension of social conditions than he ever dreamed of possessing, and, indeed, it is certain that he seldom saw more than negatively that the institutions and conventions from which he fled were hurtful, and hence declared war on all conventionality and all forms, social, legal or economic. Hence it is that to-day (while most of this spirit has passed away) he does not take kindly to the efforts which are being made to run his very revolt against established institutions into fixed forms, especially when his common sense teaches him that many of those forms were created to meet conditions which will never arise in his experience. This position was brought out with startling vividness when on a recent trip through the Dakotas we saw some of the Socialists there trying to fit their organizations to forms, whose only reason for existence was the threatening proximity of the city labor fakir and ward heeler.

The older Socialist of the cities lays great stress on certain phrases and forms of organization and manners of transacting business, and he uses the knowledge of these phrases and compliance with these forms and mannerisms as tests of the orthodoxy of his Western comrade of the prairies. If the latter does not know these phrases and does not conduct his Socialist propaganda and form his party organization on the lines laid down in the catechism and ritual of the city organization he is a heretic and must be "reorganized." What has made this situation still more aggravating is that these tests have been quite generally applied by those who were not particularly conspicuous for their knowledge of Socialist philosophy. Some comrade, who, because of his ability as an organizer or agitator, had been clothed with a little brief authority has not hesitated to settle off-hand questions of policy and tactics on which the ablest minds of the International Socialist movement have as yet failed to agree.

When the Western farmer, who is in revolt against capitalism, is met with a catechism especially prepared for the factory wage-worker, his confidence in his examiner and would-be teacher is not increased by the discovery that the aforesaid teacher is most ridiculously ignorant of the economic conditions surrounding the man whom he is so willing to teach economic philosophy.

What would the Socialists of Chicago, New York, St. Louis or San Francisco think if some farmer should be sent among them to give instruction on economic subjects and lecture them on their general relation to economic evolution, and it should happen to appear in the course of his lectures that he did not know the purpose of a trade

union, had never seen a factory in operation, and was of the opinion that the chief exploiter of the wage-worker was the pawnbroker and the local landlord. Yet he would be wisdom personified beside some of those who are setting themselves up as judges of the Socialist movement on the Great Plains of America.

Within the last few weeks some of the Socialist papers that are most willing to assist in the "reorganization" process have published articles assuming that the great farm was absorbing the smaller, and that exploitation in the case of the farmer was through mortgages and the growth of a system of tenantry. One such paper declared that the forthcoming census would show a most "startling" tendency towards the disappearance of farm ownership through the growth of mortgages and landlordism, whereas, if the editor had taken the trouble to look at the advance bulletins of that census (which may be had for the asking) he would have discovered that the number of farm owners has actually increased considerably during the last ten years, while the relative increase of mortgaged and tenant farms is so slow that, save in a few exceptional localities, the farmers are in about equal danger from the coming of the next ice age and from conversion into a race of tenant and mortgaged farmers.

Had such writers even understood Marxian economics this would have shown them that under capitalism, exploitation takes place primarily in the process of production, and not through usury and tenantry, both of which forms of exploitation belong essentially to the pre-capitalist stages of society.

But such ignorance of both economic philosophy and facts in no way deters such Socialists from pouring out the vials of their wrath on the "muddled" farmers, while they prate in an almost meaningless manner of classes and class-struggles. Not that these words do not have a very clear and proper meaning in reference to Socialist doctrines and tactics. We have no desire to join those who are seeking for a little cheap notoriety by pretending to reform the Socialist vocabulary and who are going through lexicographical contortions to demonstrate that such words as "revolutionary" and "scientific" do not belong in the Socialist dictionary. But we do wish to insist that when these words are used they should, like all other words, be used intelligently and in their proper place.

The fact is, that there is really much less tendency towards compromise among the farmers who are just now entering the Socialist movement than there is among the trade unionists who are just beginning to see the truth of the Socialist philosophy. The latter have long been accustomed to cringing and crawling before capitalist politicians to beg for legislative favors, and the Socialist platforms formulated by some of those most anxious to "reform" the farmer Socialist reflect this tendency in strings of "immediate demands" made of capitalist governments, all of which demands, by the way, are aimed to improve the condition of the working class while perpetuating wage-slavery. Nothing more could have been said of the most foolish planks in the Populist platform. In our opinion no concessions to capitalism are necessary in either case. But this is "another story" on which it is unnecessary to enter at the present time.

It chanced to be our good fortune during the past month to be pres-

ent at the State convention of the Socialist party of North Dakota, one of the States, by the way, in which the clearness of the Socialism had been objected to by the "reorganizers." Yet during that whole convention there was not even a suggestion of a proposal that involved any compromise with capitalism or the capitalist system. This is something, by the way, whether it be good or bad, that we have never yet seen in any of the many other Socialist conventions that we have attended.

These farmers have learned long ago that they have nothing to expect from capitalist governments. They are now determined on independent political action, with the object of securing collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, and, this may arouse a smile in some of our readers, one of the things of which many of them expressed a fear was that the city wage-working Socialists would sell out or "fuse" with some other party. And it must be said in their defense that their previous experience with the Knights of Labor and similar organizations has not been of a character to insure confidence in this direction.

It must not be thought, however, that all the wrong and ignorance in this dispute is to be found on any one side. If our criticisms appear to be somewhat more severe on the older, city dwelling Socialist, it is partly because he has such a multitude of capable pleaders ready to defend him, while the farmer, on the other hand, has been somewhat unfortunate in those who have taken up his case. Indeed, there has been a tendency in some quarters to exploit this division to secure other factional ends. Those who have found themselves in any way at variance with the policy and tactics of the official powers of the Socialist party have sometimes sought rather to add to this antagonism, hoping thereby to fish out of the troubled waters something in which they were personally interested. Our only purpose in entering into this controversy at all is that some of the mutual misunderstanding and mistrust may be removed, and thus the possibility be created for a stronger and more thoroughly united Socialist movement.

Again, just at the present time, the "reorganizers" chance to be in a position where their real importance is greatly magnified by the official pedestals upon which they stand, which enables them to make much more trouble than the farmers, who, as yet, have little power for good or evil. But the latter are rapidly growing in numbers and influence, and unless something is done to stop the criminally foolish and ignorant attacks that are being made upon them, we may possibly be confronted with a large and energetic split in the Socialist party. Not that this would be fatal to Socialism. Economic progress would continue and social evolution would not stand still. We would be the last to seek to prevent such a split if there really existed any defection from the principles of Socialism by any body of persons within the Socialist party. But, as we have endeavored to show, no such defection from those principles exists among those who are being driven to separate political action, and we can to-day ill-afford the costly delay that such a useless division would entail.

Far be it from us again to object to criticism or controversy. Such things are to be invited and are but signs of healthy growth. But hos-

tile criticism, or even personal abuse, is something wholly different from ignorance clothed with official power to correct and discipline.

Indeed, there are many points on which the Socialist of the prairie States needs severe criticism. He is by no means wholly free from that very American characteristic,—self-conceit. He is apt to look down upon technical economics as of no use. He feels himself capable of settling the most intricate problems of economics from the limited knowledge gained through his own personal experience. He has yet to learn that in the wide field of sociology no one man's experience is of sufficient breadth to enable him to draw any valuable conclusions. He has a very pressing need of familiarity with the great classics of Socialism. He generally knows little or nothing of the works of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the great body of writers and thinkers who have made Socialism a philosophy worthy of the study of the best minds of the world. Did he know these things he would be the better able to show the shallowness of many of the phrase-mongers who are now hurling their paper darts in his direction.

There is an intense need of good, "clear-cut, scientific" Socialist literature in the West, but if it is to be read at all it must be written by some one who knows something of the application of the philosophy of Socialism to American economic conditions, and not consist simply of intellectual gymnastics with Socialist phrases.

Again, the frontiersman is apt to fail to appreciate the importance of national and international organization, or, indeed, of any organization whatsoever. Accustomed to rely upon his own resources he does not at first see the need of wide-spread co-operation, although the history of the last fifty years in America has shown that when once the need of organization is impressed upon him he joins with his fellows with far greater readiness than even the trade unionist of the city.

There are at the present moment two great fields in which Socialist propaganda can reap rich harvests. One of these is the trade union field. Here we have plenty of trained workers. Here the propaganda is in the hands of men who understand every phase of the work, and the results which are being attained are a splendid tribute to the excellent work that is being done in this field.

Another, and equally rich, if not richer, field is to be found in the locality where the frontier has just passed away. Here the producing class—the proletariat—is largely a farming class. These men are ripe for social revolt at the present moment. Indeed, since their individual initiative is much greater than that of the wage-workers, they are going to revolt politically whether the Socialists have the sagacity to work with them or not. But if the Socialist party will see to it that men are sent among them as organizers who will not look upon themselves in the light of divinely appointed censors to correct the errors of those who often are far wiser than their teachers, then there is no reason why we should not lay the ground of a powerful united American Socialist movement.

When once the Western Socialists learn to know something more of the great classics of Socialism and the need of organization, while the Eastern comrades learn something of the facts upon which the philosophy they so glibly repeat is based, the ground will have been laid for a common understanding, and all necessity of a bitter internal fight will have passed away.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

On the March.

Another year of economic and political evolution has passed away. A tiny drop in the sea of eternity, a puny step in the development of the race, it meant 365 days of suffering, oppression, and yearning for millions of proletarians who are struggling for the ideal that is to come.

Economic evolution has greatly increased its speed during the last year. Starting at a snail's pace in the dim past of the prehistoric ages, it has gradually reached a cyclone's swiftness by the help of steam and electricity. The finger of the world's clock, American industry, points to the eleventh hour of capitalism. One man, standing on the American continent, holds the reins of commerce from Hongkong to Hamburg. The East and the West are the gates of his realm in which the sun never sets. Britannia rules the waves, if he permits. The haughty Hohenzollern dares not say him nay. The gloomy Russian despot cannot bid him halt. A stroke of his pen reduces the Chinese wall to crumbling ruins. He is master of the world by the grace of the dollar, and the rulers by the grace of God pay homage to him. He is the incarnation of Mammon's power in general and the crown of American capitalism in particular. He is the manifest destiny that "set Cuba free" to grasp it the more securely, that drove the Boers out of their homes to make them "free" Britons, that opened the door of the Celestial empire for the hell of Western civilization, and that makes terms to the representative of the Almighty in Rome.

Uncle Sam fought hard to break the chains of British bondage, and now the torch of liberty is smoldering beneath the crushing weight of industrial feudalism. He battled still harder to abolish slavery, and now his flag is waving over slaves at home and abroad. He thought he was building the home of the free, and now he finds that he is a back number, a Utopian dreamer, devoid of practical business sense. The Declaration of Independence, of which he was so proud, is suppressed in the shadow of his own flag. The Fourth of July orator stands by the side of the judge who jails women for speaking in defense of their own class. A handful of industrial magnates laugh millions to scorn and starve them into submission. The children of the nation, hardly born, are tied to the car of the Juggernaut of toil and crushed before they have seen the light of reason.

Thousands are starving in Germany, hundred thousands in Russia, millions in India. The wave of prosperity has risen to a giddy height, and in its train follows the inevitable wave of misery, crime and revolt.

Injunctions against labor are falling thicker than hail. Already we are forbidden to think aloud, and as soon as the chemists will have solved the problem of life we may expect an injunction against being born on the land of the corporations. The increase of profits on the one side is accompanied by an appalling number of fatal accidents on the other. A tremendous unemployed problem is slowly preparing, and the first seismic shocks of another commercial crisis are shaking the foundations of bourgeois society.

The reaction of economic conditions in the United States is pressing hard on European industries and agriculture. The billion dollar steel trust followed by a transportation trust embracing the principal transatlantic lines with Morgan at the head is putting the iron, coal and transportation of the world at the mercy of American capitalists. John Bull's plight is a standing joke in the American press. But Germany, Austria and France are in a similar position. The diplomats are demanding an alliance of all European powers against the American invasion. Whatever political benefits the ruling classes may temporarily derive from such an alliance, it would not alter the course of economic development. No matter how the political map is colored, the economic potencies of Europe are not increased one whit. America has irrevocably outclassed the old world. Such demands are only the unconscious admission that the evolution of capitalism has passed beyond the limits of political boundaries, and that a new system of society is required to meet the commercial supremacy of the United States. But neither royalty, nor the aristocratic statesmen, nor the captains of European industry are equal to this emergency. The only element capable of coping with the situation is the international social democracy.

Seen in this light, the claim that the capitalist system could last indefinitely reveals simply that the men who make it judge world conditions from the horizon of their own backyard. Economic and political phenomena of to-day must be viewed in their entirety. In olden times a good diplomatic axiom to follow was: "Cherchez la femme!" To-day it is safer to say: "Cherchez Morgan!" He is the leading political factor as well as the king of capitalism, and the chief agitator for international Socialism.

Thanks to his splendid efforts, socialism is marching to the front. In the United States the unity convention assembled the makers of the future in Indianapolis, a year ago, and sounded the tocsin for a real "American" movement. A few weeks after that the nerveless upholsterers of the passing social order, the Eltweed Pomeroy, Tom L. Johnson, Golden Rule Jones, et al., met in Detroit—morituri nos salutabant. The McKinley-Ozolsz incident revealed to the whole country the sharp line of division between socialism and anarchism. The attempt to suppress Wayland's "Appeal to Reason" and Wilshire's "Challenge" failed. Socialism, the "Crying Evil of the Hour," smilingly met its old and familiar enemy, the political organization of the Catholic Church, also on American soil, and welcomed his valuable cooperation. The great strike of the Amalgamated Association against the steel barons gave another object lesson of the futility of economic organization without political aims. The immediate result was the

election of an independent labor candidate in San Francisco, Cal., and Northport, Wash., and a class-conscious campaign in Erie, Pa. The attempt to sidetrack the Chicago labor movement into an independent alley found the Socialists too strong for the labor misleaders. The number of Socialist locals in all parts of the land increased rapidly, a sign of the growing political intelligence. Socialism found its way into the columns of the remotest country papers. The anthracite miners' strike, still raging, is another eloquent proof of our great prosperity being a class prosperity, and found an echo in the class-conscious declarations of the American Labor Union, the Western Federation of Miners, and a number of other labor organizations, that adopted the Socialist platform at their conventions. Porto Rico had its labor troubles as soon as American politicians seized the public power, and found Socialists in their way. Cuba is still too unsettled to permit any social development. In general, the past year stands alone for progress in the history of the labor movement and augurs well for the future. Watch our vote at the next Presidential election!

England is still the land of "pure and simple" in trades unionism. Thanks to the compromising tendencies of the Fabians and the Independent Labor party, the political intelligence of the organized industrial proletariat in the capitalistically most developed country of Europe is still far behind that of the rural population in the semi-feudal States of Southern Europe. Were it not for the Social Democratic Federation, the outlook for Socialism in England would be cheerless. Happily, English capitalism has now reached a stage where it can no longer afford to carry its liberal mask. The American injunction has been imported with the other American products, and helps to dispel the liberal cobwebs from the brains of the trade unionists. There is still hope for them, and the S. D. F. is making headway. So is Socialism in Ireland.

Germany was the first, after England, to feel the pressure of American development, mainly because fraudulent operations at the great banks precipitated a panic. The immense expenses of the army, navy and military operations in China and Africa, added to the difficulties of the situation. An army of unemployed revealed the rottenness of bourgeois prosperity and furnished strength to the fight of the Socialists against the agrarian tariff on foodstuffs. Several secret documents of the imperial government fell into the hands of the Socialists and were used by them to good effect. The Luebeck congress of the German Socialist party showed once more how little sympathy the rank and file has for opportunism, and three million petitions against the tariff laws opened a pleasing prospect for large Socialist gains in the coming elections. The first fruits of their labors have already been gathered by the German comrades in several after-elections to the Reichstag and in numerous municipal elections. The movement has gained ground especially among the farming population of the East and North, the Catholic farmers of the South and the Catholic miners of the Rhine districts.

Austria-Hungary has witnessed a great proletarian awakening. The Socialists have cleared the field for united action by the thorough revision of their program, which gave careful consideration to all the

latest phases of the industrial development and little show to the Bernsteinian creed of an increasing middle class.

In France little progress has been made. The Millerand question proved a serious obstacle to Socialist unity. The opportunist tactics of the ministerialists lamed the revolutionary spirit of their constituency and blurred the sharp class line between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The class-conscious wing of the Socialist party was thus forced to fight not alone the capitalist enemy, but also the Socialist friends. Instead of a united front, the French proletariat exposed a disordered line of battle to the capitalist attack. Under these circumstances it is a wonder that any progress was made at all.

The Belgian comrades had an exciting time. Their fight for universal suffrage reached a dangerous climax. Blood was spilled and the number of brave proletarians who died for their cause was once more increased. The Catholic state proved still too strong for our comrades; but the general strike called by them in support of their demands brought out in strong relief the discipline and political maturity of the Belgian workingmen. Their example deserves emulation, and American workingmen will find food for serious reflection in the idea of a combined strike of the principal American labor unions during a presidential election for the purpose of giving force to their vote for the Socialist party.

The Danish comrades have become "the" party of opposition in Parliament. The liberal party is at the helm of the state, and the Socialists are in undisputed possession of the opposition. With their widespread co-operatives, their well-established press, and the smallness of the territory which they have to conquer, they are in no danger of staying behind on our march to victory. The comrades in Holland are doing their best to keep in line with their neighbors in Belgium and Germany, and even little Luxemburg boasts of some Socialists in public bodies.

The Italian comrades have struck the Hydra of the Camorra a crushing blow and gained a strong foothold among the population of the South of Italy, which had been considered unfit for Socialist agitation. The movement in the North of Italy has marshaled the rural population into a well disciplined corps of class-conscious fighters, who are standing by their colors, although the king is trying to lure them astray by the bait of state Socialism. The waves of Socialism are washing against the walls of the Vatican, and it is doubtful whether the next Pope will remain in the classic land of Papal tradition or move to some more comfortable place. Unless it retires to one of the poles of the earth, ecclesiastical hierarchy, like all other despotism, will soon be crowded off the earth.

The growth of Socialism in the Spanish labor unions is a reflex of the same movement in America. Spain has suffered a great deal from anarchist disturbances, but the Spanish workingmen have learned that trades unions and Socialism are logical complements of the same semi-circle of humanity. While the spoiled boy on the throne vents his divine brutishness in true Cæsarian style, even on his own mother, the children of the proletarians are learning the lessons of a nobler and higher manhood in the school of the fight for liberty.

In Switzerland the movement has made remarkable gains during the last year. With the advent of the Gruetli-Bund and the reorganization of the party, surprising victories have been won in the recent cantonal elections. In the Scandinavian peninsula the movement for manhood and female suffrage has resulted in a great improvement of the election laws, which brought immediate Socialist victories in several municipal elections.

Russia is preparing for a grand social upheaval. The academies, the industries and the rural population are permeated with revolutionary sentiment, to which the Socialists are giving an intelligent direction. Even Siberia has its secret Socialist organization. Bulgaria, Servia and Roumania have shown a marked progress in Socialist organization and some gains in parliamentary representation.

Japan has seen its first official suppression of Socialism as a political party. But the propaganda of the ideas continues unabated in speech and writing. The two principal labor unions have adopted the Socialist platform. Australia and New Zealand also have their Socialist parties, and the Argentine Republic has a growing Socialist outpost on the South American continent.

The Socialist movement of the world is firmly established, and its growth cannot be disputed. Nowhere is our progress so palpable and so rapid as in the United States. All indications point to the probability that American Socialism will be the champion who will batter down the walls of capitalism. And a Socialist administration in Washington can dictate its terms to the powers of Europe by force of its economic superiority.

Onward, comrades! The goal is in sight!

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union declared for Socialism at its recent convention in New York and elected Peter Schlesinger, a Chicago Socialist, delegate to the A. F. of L. The Patternmakers' League of North America, at its convention in Chicago, adopted a preamble in favor of collective ownerships of the tools of production, and it is probable that James Wilson, the new national president, who is a Socialist, will represent the union at New Orleans. The Iowa State Federation declared for Socialism and the Colorado Federation did likewise, and also voted practical support to the Socialist party. The number of converts who are now coming into the Socialist party, many of whom were prominent in reform parties of the past, is becoming so great that it is impossible to mention them individually. The greatest enthusiasm exists, judging from the party and labor press all over the country, especially in Pennsylvania, Colorado, Montana, Washington and other Western States. The vote in Oregon, where the gain averaged over 200 per cent, is a straw that shows how the wind is blowing. At present tickets are up in about twenty States with more to hear from, and everything points to large increases all along the line.

The struggle between the miners and the operators has developed into a battle of endurance. All attempts to arbitrate the trouble have been coldly turned down by the coal barons, while the miners, after discussing the situation for several days, decided not to order out the bituminous men, but levy assessments on all who are working and send a general call to other trade unions and sympathizers for funds to continue the fight indefinitely. In the anthracite region the agents of the coal magnates and their deputies, coal and iron police and scabs, are making every effort to exasperate the strikers and force them to commit overt acts in order that the Pennsylvania militia may be called out. On the other hand the unionists throughout the district are waging a silent, peaceful contest, and hundreds of them are eagerly studying the doctrines of Socialism, with a view to continuing the strike at the polls until the yoke of capitalism has been finally shaken off. The Socialist party speakers are listened to with marked attention and are welcomed, and it appears that the workers are finally beginning to comprehend the significance of the class struggle. In the West Virginia district the struggle is not one whit less desperate. Seven organizers have been sent to prison for violating an injunction, and Judge Jackson only hesitated to send Mother Jones to jail because of the revulsion of feeling that it would cause throughout the country. The capitalists and politicians have played every scheme to force Mother Jones out

of the State, but she refuses to go, and may yet be imprisoned for her work and devotion to the miners' cause. The national union will require half a million dollars a week to continue the strike, and every Socialist in the land ought to consider it a duty to contribute as liberally as possible, not only advice and sympathy, but dollars, which are most important at this juncture. It is quite likely that the organized workers of Great Britain will come to the rescue with goodly sums, as the writer has received information from Ben Tillett that they would be glad to respond, and President Mitchell has probably already sent a call across the water. All union men feel that a crisis has been reached by organized labor, and they will use all the means within their power to defeat the autocratic capitalists who have monopolized the anthracite coal fields. It is currently reported that the coal kings have appealed for moral and financial aid to all the employers' combines in the country, declaring that if the strikers are allowed to win capitalistic institutions and investments will no longer be safe in the United States. Undoubtedly the present war between labor and capital is the clearest and most marked drawing of class lines that has ever taken place in this country.

Rumors and complaints continue to circulate around labor circles that scores of teamsters and freight handlers who participated in the Chicago strikes are being victimized and blacklisted, and that the capitalists, as is usual in all large affairs of this kind, have broken their agreements. The former strikers are also said to be extremely bitter toward certain officials of the Chicago Federation of Labor, who are accused of having been cowardly and lukewarm all through the strike. They are charged with seeking offices on the Democratic ticket and with deliberately protecting the Harrison ring by throwing a wet blanket over the strike at a critical time, so that the politicians might not be forced to call out the police, and thus lose prestige. Investigations are reported to be in progress, and they may throw light on the matter.

The Newkirk Socialist is another new Oklahoma paper.

The Union Labor Central Club of San Francisco have sent a circular to all unions in the State, requesting them to elect delegates to a convention on Sept. 10 for the purpose of nominating a State Labor ticket, or indorsing one of the regular party tickets. It looks as though there will be merry war from the start.

The brassworkers of Cleveland were injunctioned by Judge Babcock, an enthusiastic Bryan Democrat, during their strike for the nine-hour day, which they won despite all obstacles. Babcock's action has knocked those workingmen speechless who still imagined that some reforms and decent treatment could be secured in the d. o. p.

The Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee is incubating a scheme to form a new national organization, to be composed of city central bodies. This proposition has been discussed for a good many years. The idea is to arrange plans to carry on systematic work in municipalities and aim to secure control of governments through independent political action.

Wisconsin Supreme Court knocked out the law prohibiting employers from discharging workers for being members of a union. Same old song.

The attempt to combine the longshoremen, seamen, tugmen and other workers on and along the lakes is meeting with success. The tugmen are now going into the new amalgamation, which will probably also affiliate with the transport workers of Europe.

Mechanics and laborers are warned not to go to Los Angeles, Cal. An employers' combine in that city is attempting to flood the city with unemployed men, in order to beat down wages and disrupt the unions. Employers' organizations are forming in nearly every city in the country, with the avowed purpose of protecting bosses in whose establishments strikes occur, blacklisting agitators and smashing unions that try to improve the conditions of the workers. The capitalists are no longer denying the fact that a class struggle exists.

On the same day that President Schwab, of the United States Steel Corporation, announced in all the daily papers that his octopus was worth \$1,400,000,000, and would make profits at the rate of \$140,000,000 a year, an item appeared in an obscure corner of the same papers stating that the American Tin Plate Company, a constituent part of the great trust, proposed to reduce the wages of the tin workers 25 per cent. The trust needs the extra 25 per cent to make sure that the profits will be \$140,000,000. The tin workers are well organized and yet they are almost helpless. For years the iron and steel and tin plate workers have been clamoring for high tariff and they are now receiving "protection" with a vengeance. With new machinery and wage reductions confronting them, it is quite likely that the workers will learn that it does not pay to vote the same way as when industry was in its formative period. Many of them are becoming ardent Socialists.

As has been predicted in these columns, Congress adjourned for the summer with the eight-hour, anti-injunction, prison labor and other bills securely stowed away in pigeon holes. As if to heap insult on injury, the politicians of the House came forward at the eleventh hour with a sop in the shape of an arbitration bill. The President is empowered to appoint three members of a commission of five, the capitalists to appoint another, and the laborites the fifth. Of course, Roosevelt would appoint three politicians or "citizens," who would be considered "safe" by the capitalists, so that a 4x1 result could be obtained, a little better than the Hanna's 24x12 scheme. It is needless to say that the union officials and labor press all over the country are denouncing the Washington politicians in heated terms for these latest evidences of "friendliness" toward the workers. But if they stop at mere general condemnation they might as well save themselves worry and trouble. It's votes that count, and to turn down the hypocritical politicians and send another bunch as bad to Washington will do no good. The only way anything will be gained is to elect labor men on the Socialist party ticket. They are class-conscious workers who champion a labor platform and uphold labor principles.

A new machine that not only saves labor, as the term is generally

understood, but almost completely abolishes a whole army of workers, is being installed along the lake ports. The new revolutionizer is a combination of Hullett's clam shell ore hoisting apparatus and the Gayley style of ships. When it was found difficult to hoist ore from the hold of an ordinary vessel, a new form was built—just as the railways are introducing new cars that drop coal and iron ore through the bottom and make shovelers unnecessary. The billion-dollar steel trust has been experimenting for some time at its docks in Conneaut, Ohio, with the new method of unloading device, and President Schwab recently visited that port and pronounced the machinery an unqualified success. A leading representative of a great labor union also visited Conneaut recently for the purpose of looking into the conditions. When about to leave a press correspondent asked him if he thought the new labor saving machinery would injure the laboring man. His reply was quick: "No, we are not afraid of being injured by labor saving machinery, but those clam shell ore hoists are not of that class. They are nothing less than labor abolishing machinery." In this view he spoke near the truth. The clam-shells need but two men to operate each machine. They lift twelve tons at each swing and will work out the largest vessel that plies the great lakes in less than two hours. They handle on an average of six vessels a day, doing the work at a cost of below 4 cents per ton, a work that has always cost from 10 to 15 cents a ton by the aid of any of the other machines constructed and hand labor.

In New York the third-rail system is being introduced on the elevated railways, displacing locomotive engineers with motor men, and automatic ticket sellers and ticket takers are being experimented with. The Chicago street railway capitalists are trying a new motive force. An electro-magnet has been invented which is imbedded between the rails. It pulls or backs a car and no brakes are required to stop it, while it is confidently asserted that overhead and underground wires will be done away with. The great saving which the inventor claims is in the amount of electricity required. He says seventy-five amperes will suffice for forty cars, while with the present trolley system seventy-five amperes are required for one car. He says the saving in coal will be more than one-half. It is also claimed that the cars can be run faster than trolley cars because they are always under perfect control. They can never jump the track because there is a down pull as well as a forward pull in the magnets. It is thought that it will be easy to run the cars at one hundred miles an hour with safety. Thus the work of abolishing mechanics and laborers is steadily going forward.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Truth About Socialism. John Collins. Appeal to Reason. Paper, 111 pp. 25 cents.

It is hard to find something new to say of all the books that are being sent out at the present time, the object of each of which is to explain Socialism to the beginner. This one is perhaps a little more satisfactory than the majority of such books. It is written in clear, readable English, and those who read it will have a very clear idea of Socialism. There can never be too many such books, even though they do all really tell the same story, for the story is one which will well bear repetition.

The Impending Social Revolution, or the Trust Problem Solved. By J. Stitt Wilson. Published by the Social Crusade, Byrne Building, Los Angeles, Cal. Paper, 35 pp. 10 cents.

As an "awakener" to the injustice of present conditions and a powerful short presentation of Socialism, there are few, if any, books yet published equal to this. Its main strength lies in its dramatic presentation of the subject which will hold the reader to the end and then leave a lasting impression upon his mind that will not let him rest until he shall take some effective action. No soldier in the Socialist army can afford to leave this out of his ammunition chest.

Tales from Gorky. Translated by R. Nisbet Bain. Funk & Wagnals. Cloth, 285 pp. \$1.20.

The nine tales comprised in this book comprise some of the strongest work of this great Russian "tramp." They consist, like most of his other writings of tales from the "under world," and some of them are doubtless autobiographical. This is especially probable of "Twenty-six of Us and One Other," and "One Autumn Night." There is a new portrait and a biographical sketch which gives some additional facts concerning this remarkable writer. All of the stories are filled with the bitter philosophy for which Gorky has become famous. It is difficult to describe one of these stories. They are already condensed to the limit. Their flavor, too, is so utterly different from those of any other writer that they must be read to be understood.

In "Chelkash" we have some keen psychological analysis of the effect of the impulse of greed on different human natures. "A Rolling Stone" is perhaps the most complete exposition of what might be termed the "philosophy of vagrancy" that has ever been published. It is tales like these that see to the very heart of things that show the utter superficiality of such writers as Wycoff and "Josiah Flint."

Die Geschichte und Litteratur der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in ihren Hauptzuegen. Von Paul Kampffmeyer. Publishers: Herm. Sydow & Co., Nuernberg, Germany.

This little volume sketches in broad and striking outlines the history and literature of the Socialist movement in Germany. It introduces the student into the fundamental principles of Socialism, enables him to find at a glance the most valuable material stored up in the Socialist literature of Germany on any phase of social progress, and touches in graphic language on the historical events which found expression in that literature. An English translation of this valuable contribution will shortly appear in our Standard Socialist Series.

The Americanization of the World, or the Trend of the Twentieth Century. By W. T. Stead. Horace Markley. 460 pp. \$1.50.

Mr. Stead has caught and described in his remarkably graphic style the tremendous spread of American capitalism. He sees Ireland a center of American influence in the British Empire, South Africa a second edition of the United States, while all of the British colonies are copying American institutions and customs. American heiresses are capturing the European nobility while American capitalists are conquering the markets hitherto considered the peculiar property of Europeans. In spite of its sometimes extravagant rhetoric and occasional bombastic style, which serves to remind one of the "Americanization of literature," the book is remarkably entertaining and suggestive. The author, however, is wholly blind to the great forces within the various nations, which are apt to call a halt to all exploitation, and "Americanization" along with the rest, for, after all, what Mr. Stead calls "Americanism" is nothing more than capitalism carried to its logical conclusion—or, rather, stopped just short of the conclusion, which is—Socialism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Engels' Origin of the Family.

Some months ago we announced a translation by Ernest Untermann of Frederick Engels' work, entitled "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State." We are glad to say that the printing of the book is now nearly finished, and that we expect to fill orders for it on or about August 25th.

This is a work of immense importance both to students and to those who wish to make converts to Socialism. Most people imagine that private property, as we see it to-day, is something that always has been and always will be. This book gives abundant facts to prove that private property is really something of brief duration as compared with the ages through which the race passed before its appearance. The mass of detail gathered by Lewis H. Morgan in his "Ancient Society" has been used by Engels with full credit and great discrimination. Only the matter of real interest and importance has been retained in the present work, while it is supplemented by Engels' own researches in other fields.

This is one of the few books that no Socialist can afford to leave unread, and it is now for the first time offered to English readers. It is published in the Standard Socialist series, bound in cloth, uniform with Liebknecht's "Memoirs of Marx," Vandervelde's "Collectivism," Simons' "The American Farmer" and Broome's "Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association," and the price, including postage, is 50 cents. To anyone sending \$2.00 before September 1, 1902, we will send the five books by express prepaid.

Socialist Literature for the Striking Coal Miners.

In last month's issue of the International Socialist Review we invited our readers to contribute whatever sums they could to pay for Socialist books and pamphlets to be sent to the striking miners in the anthracite coal fields. Comrade J. Mahlon Barnes, state secretary of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania, has furnished us with addresses of a number of Socialists who are in a position to make the best possible use of all literature sent them, and we have been forwarding leaflets and booklets selected by him to the various addresses as fast

as contributions received have made it possible. Up to the time of going to press we have received the following amounts:

John Sailer, McLouth, Kansas.....	\$ 1.40
H. R. Kearns, Arlington, N. J.....	1.00
E. A. Hoagland, Arlington, N. J.....	.50
D. E. O. Duffie, Dover, N. H.....	.40
I. E., Chicago.....	7.00
Thomas Buckman, Marshfield, Oregon.....	.75
Mrs. N. H. B., Chicago.....	.75

Total\$11.40

The article by Comrade Mailly in this issue of the Review will make it clear to every reader that there is still urgent need for more literature to be sent to Pennsylvania, and we trust that our readers will respond liberally. As announced in last month's issue, we will send into the State as much literature as the contributions will pay for, when figured at our lowest stockholders' prices.

Have You Read It?

The two great classics of Socialism are Karl Marx's "Capital" and Frederick Engel's "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." "Capital" is expensive to purchase, technical in its language and difficult of comprehension without long and patient study. "Socialism Utopian and Scientific" is equally fundamental and even better fitted to give a general knowledge of the principles of Socialism. It has for many years been recognized by the Socialists of the world as one of the great text books of Socialism. It has been translated into the language of every people who have reached the stage of capitalism. It gives the historic basis of Socialism and traces the philosophy for the phantasies of dreamers to the firm base of scientifically established fact.

So essential has this book come to be to the philosophy of Socialism that its reading is absolutely essential to any one who would really grasp the fundamentals of that philosophy. At the same time it is written in a clear and easily intelligible style. Our edition is the standard translation by Dr. Edward Aveling, and it contains the notable preface by Engel discussing economic determinism or the materialistic conception of history,—a preface of scarcely less importance than the work itself. Price, in cloth, 30 cents; in paper, 10 cents, postpaid.

The Work of Our Co-Operative Publishing House.

The International Socialist Review, as most of its readers know, is owned by a co-operative company consisting of a rapidly increasing number of stockholders (396 as this number of The Review goes to press), most of whom have invested just \$10.00 each. The object of the company is to circulate the literature of CLEAR SOCIALISM IN CLEAR ENGLISH. Not merely the amount, but the quality of the

Socialist literature that is circulated will determine the growth of the movement.

Every dollar of capital invested in our company for the last three years has gone into the publication of just such books, pamphlets and leaflets as the Socialist party needs most urgently. If you want to put ten, a hundred or a thousand dollars where it will help most effectively to bring in the new social order, this is the place. If you want to know how at the same time you will benefit yourself and the local work in which you are interested, write us for particulars. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS,
56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1902.

NO. 3.

The International Situation and the International Socialist Bureau.

THERE was never, perhaps, a time in the whole history of the Socialist movement when it was more necessary that representatives of the different national parties should meet together as an International Socialist Council to confer and to give their views as to the present position of international politics. Many things are taking place which must have a direct and important influence upon the future of our party, and Socialists, who ought to be at least as well informed in regard to current events as the Catholic Church or the Jews, cannot at all afford to be taken by surprise. We are deeply interested in the national and international relations of all the peoples of the civilized world, and now that Japan has taken her place not only in the field of European and Asiatic State Policy, but also as represented by a definite Socialist party, the affairs of the Far East not only indirectly but directly concern us.

Yet it is quite certain that the majority of well-known Socialists to-day, though they proclaim themselves Internationalists, take a much less wide view of the general development than their predecessors. So far also the International Socialist Bureau, from which so much was hoped when it was established in 1900 at the Congress of Paris, has failed to correct this tendency. A meeting of the Bureau once in twelve months is obviously a reduction of the whole thing to an absurdity; for we are quite sure our Belgian comrades would be the last to claim that either their national position or their personal knowledge can enable them to fulfil the duties of a thoroughly well-informed International Council. We all need for our guidance that comparison of opinion on various difficult points which can only be obtained by direct personal contact; for there are many matters which cannot be safely or fully discussed by correspondence and many others on which far more needs to be said than is being said to-day.

Thus in every European country at the present time there is

a more or less marked increase among the well-to-do classes of national, chauvinist or race feeling. This is, of course, in the clearest opposition to our whole teaching. It is not too much to say, for example, that owing to the treatment of the Poles by the German government, to the antagonism fostered between the German and the Slav elements in Austria and to the steady policy of Russia, the bitterness between the two rival races of Eastern and Southeastern Europe is greater than it has been for some time past. True, our Austrian comrades have given a great example to the world when men of the most widely differing stocks have cast their votes steadily for the Social-Democratic candidate. But this only shows that Socialism alone can find the means of harmonizing the conflicting elements wherever they may be brought together. It does not justify us in overlooking such a speech as that delivered not long ago by Dr. Korvak against the Kaiser and his pan-Germanizing allies or the chorus of jubilation with which that speech was received in every Slav community. With this, as an Englishman, it is true, I have nothing to do any more than a Frenchman is called upon to meddle in the matter. But as International Socialists we are bound to take account of the rising temper on both sides and to recognize it as a great obstacle to our progress now and in the near future.

Similarly, it is surely worthy of our attention that whatever may be the relations between the two governments, or however determined the Social-Democratic party in Germany and the comparatively small but nevertheless active Socialist sections in England may be to prevent active unpleasantness, the antagonism between Great Britain and the German Empire at this moment is not only keen, but is increasing in intensity on both sides. German newspapers openly declare and German admirals and German military men readily confirm that Germany should keep on good terms with England only until she feels strong enough to beat her at sea; while on England's side a vigorous effort is being made by leading reviews and newspapers, especially since peace was concluded in South Africa, to show that Germany is the real enemy alike in peace and in war, and that it is useless to put off the evil day to a period when she will be stronger than she is now. Of course, nothing may come of all this sound and fury. But the fact remains that from the point of view of capitalism and colonization, the interests of Germany, as advocated by some of her most influential men, are absolutely irreconcilable with those of England, and that Englishmen as well as Germans are beginning to recognize that there is a clearer antagonism here than any which can exist between them and France, Russia or America, so long as trade competition and expansion are the ruling factors in the world policy. Nor does the renewal of the triple alliance, nor England's

good feeling as a nation towards Italy, mollify this growing ill-feeling between the two peoples.

Then again, speaking only of what is manifest to all, the condition of Russia is one of unstable equilibrium. But for the French money which she is using to pay her knouting Cossacks and her torturing gaolers, Russia would to-day be bankrupt. That she is already in the rapids of revolution even the most furious efforts of her government to suppress information cannot disguise from the Western world. But lack of money and internal disturbance never prevented a great nation from following its traditional policy. On the contrary, the lack of funds and the difficulty of carrying out a ruthless system of repression in time of peace have often induced a despot or a camarilla to resort to war as a diversion, whatever might come after. The idea in Germany among the Socialists, I believe, is that Russia is so much occupied with events in China, to say nothing of internal difficulties, that any move on her part in the direction of Turkey is not worthy of consideration. That does not seem to me the correct view at all. The alliance between England and Japan, if it means anything at all, means a definite check to Russian ambition in China for the time being, at any rate. And in the meantime Japanese officers are thoroughly reorganizing and training the Chinese army. If a move cannot be avoided, I venture to assume it will not be in that quarter, where, in addition to England and Japan, the United States may have a word to say. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that such tremendous warlike preparations ashore and afloat have been made at Sebastopol (from which town and fortress all foreigners are now rigorously excluded), merely for the pleasure of a military and naval review; that the important ports of Bourgas and Varna are being brought directly under the control of Russia by recent action in Bulgaria without some serious object in view in the near future; that the Armenian troubles—I know I am not altogether at one with some Socialists on this eternal Armenian question—would be brought to the front just now unless some new move were intended; or that the very heavy expenditure now being incurred by Russia on warlike preparations generally would be sanctioned, in the existing condition of Russian finances, unless a definite policy had already been decided upon. I do not say that we are on the eve of another peaceable or forcible reduction of the extent of the Turkish Empire, but I do urge that it would be well for Socialists to take counsel together at this juncture and to make up their minds how their great and growing influence is to be exerted with effect at the critical moment. Furthermore, it would be extremely interesting to learn at first hand from our Roumanian and Bulgarian comrades what view is taken in their country of a position which so nearly affects

them. Neither here nor elsewhere can we afford to be taken by surprise.

Even more worthy of continuous and combined attention is the growing power of the great trusts in Europe and all over the world. Socialists themselves do not as a mass fully appreciate the meaning of this tremendous development. We are only *at the beginning* of this consolidation of monopoly. It is inevitable and it is to a large extent automatic. For example, I have good reason to believe that Mr. John D. Rockefeller had not the slightest desire to go into the Steel Trust. He could not help himself. His own accumulations have overmastered him. Lap over they must. Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Pierpont Morgan are not men of genius; they are simply the clever but commonplace representatives of an unconscious financial and industrial evolution. There is a "scare" throughout Europe at this so-called "American invasion;" but so far there has been no authorized pronouncement on this remarkable phenomenon from qualified Socialists as an International body. Such a pronouncement cannot possibly be left to our local Belgian friends, who really know very little about the matter. Yet the development calls for earnest attention. The Trusts which Mr. Morgan represents in the world of finance are estimated to have at their control for any project on which they may set their mind capital to the value of \$3,000,000,000. Mr. Rockefeller's personal income this year is put at \$100,000,000. Granting him a round \$5,000,000 to spend upon himself, \$95,000,000 must *lap over somewhere*. And Mr. Rockefeller, after all, is only one of the billionaires whose unexpended revenues must now be employed for the most part outside the United States. Nothing approaching to this on such a scale has ever yet been seen. It is an entirely new development which, though partially foreseen and predicted by myself and others as the probable outcome of American trustification, has come about much more quickly than was anticipated. This means that we are feeling the collapse of national and international competition and are nearing the stage of national and international monopoly. Rockefeller, Morgan & Co. are doing our work for us better than we Social-Democrats could do it for ourselves.

Yet as Socialists we have no international policy on this great Trust question. We have never thoroughly debated the matter among ourselves. Nevertheless, the moment is close at hand when we must act and act capably and concertedly. Let me hope, therefore, that the members of the International Socialist Bureau will, on the grounds stated above—and many other reasons could be given—arouse themselves from their deep sleep and come together for business.

H. M. HYNDMAN,

The Land of the Noonday Night.

A Miner's Song,

We have eyes to see like yours
Way down in the deep, deep mine,
But there's nothing to mark but the dreadful dark
Where the sun can never shine.
On the banks of clammy coal
Our lamps cast a flickering light
At the bottom drear of the moist black hole
In the land of the noonday night.

We have children at home like yours,
But at eve when we homeward tread
We find them asleep in a tangled heap,
Three or four in a single bed.
In the morning our tasks begin
Before the sun shines bright,
For we have no sun and we have no kin
In the land of the noonday night.

But our home is not like yours.
'Tis a bare, unpainted shack,
Where the raindrops pour on the shaky floor,
And the coal-dust stains it black.
Not a flower or blade of grass
Can escape the grimy blight,
For the face of our yard is seared and scarred
In the land of the noonday night.

But the men who own the mines,
And who live like kings of old—
Ah! little they care how their wage-slaves fare,
So long as they get their gold!
And the fire-damp may explode
And a thousand die outright,
For the men come cheap who go down deep
In the land of the noonday night.

And like feathers they weigh the coal
When they pay us by the head,
But for you who buy it twice too high
They weigh it like chunks of lead.

And our wage goes back in rent—
For they have us in such a plight—
And they squeeze us sore at the company's store
In the land of the noonday night.

And we labor with straining arms
For the pittance they deign to give,
And our boys must quit the school for the pit
To drudge that we all may live.
And our teeth feel the grit of the mine
In the very bread we bite,
Till our inmost soul is defiled with coal
In the land of the noonday night.

And if in the end we dare
To assert our just demands,
Then their courts emit an injunction writ
To shackle our tongues and hands.
And if in spite of their frown
We protest that we will unite,
Then they lock us up or they shoot us down
In the land of the noonday night.

Who was it that made the coal?
Our God as well as theirs!
If he gave it free to you and me,
Then keep us out who dares!
Let the people own their mines—
Bitumen and anthracite—
And the right prevail under hill and dale
In the land of the noonday night.

ERNEST CROSBY.

Rhinebeck, N. Y.

The Revolutionary Method.

(From "Il Socialismo," Vol. I., No. 7, 1902.)



ET us above all explain ourselves clearly. The "Critica Sociale" of May first, 1902, asks in the article, "The Spiral of the First of May": "What has become of the the noise that was made about the 'Ministerialism' of the Socialists? Who still takes the childishly fanciful idea of a revolution in contradiction to reform seriously? It is about the same as if a forest were to reproach its trees that they interfere with its own dignity by their massive trunks and intricate branches. Compromising and uncompromising; revolutionary method and law-abiding method; possibilism and impossibilism—how far away and antiquated are these word plays, these verbal vanities from which other impotent and bitter vanities could for a moment arise and disport themselves before the temporarily confused masses."

Far away and antiquated?

Why, on the contrary, on the last page of the same number of "Critica Sociale," G. Cassola insists on the different tendencies in the Socialist party under the form of a personal critique of my political attitude. He calls it "misleading," because I am, according to him, "revolutionary" * * * but in the Copernican sense; anti-ministerialist * * * but vote from case to case for the Ministry; uncompromising * * * but do not disdain alliances." So that "Ferri has created for himself a condition of equivocation by which every one of his acts contradicts some one of his fundamental premises."

And, apart from such personal polemics, we have only to read our weeklies in order to see the controversy about the different tendencies raging back and forth over every incident of the administrative and political battle.

Far away and antiquated? But this is only an illusion of those who attribute to the whole party this state of a swampy quietude which is at present found only in parliament, and is there mainly as the inevitable consequence of that "ministerial Socialism" which relieves the government of the spur and fear of the clamoring hosts that alone impel the rulers, the happy possessors, to move and do something.

The railway employes were promised a fixed salary and an increase, and it was said the law relative to this would be passed without fail in April. But after the government had been sustained by the vote of parliament, the machine slowly goes about finding the millions necessary for the realization of the measure, and on May 20th, the date of this writing, the railway employes

are still waiting for the fruits of the ministerialist vote given by the Socialists on March 15th.

We have had a spectacular demonstration of 200 unions in favor of the law on female and child labor, a largely artificial action, because such a law interests only a small part of the industrial proletariat of Italy and does not provide either for the agricultural proletariat or affect even indirectly the lack of employment and the chronic hunger which are the sorest wounds inflicted by surplus value. We have also had, during the discussion of this law, to which the government, of course, opposed a ministerial project, the absence of the reform Socialists from the chamber, although they formed the majority of the parliamentary group. And thus we have received the first abortion of a law which is still far from being passed, because much water will flow down the hills, before the Senate will decide to mutilate it still more. The same thing happened to the former bill on child labor in 1886, which is also suffering from anemia and has mostly remained ineffective. And in the meantime we hope that the same Senate will find a way to pass that other great reform of the "labor bureaus" which will give to the proletariat the consolation to write the statistics * * * of their own misery, which they may read to one another * * * in their labor homes which the Honorable Luigi Luzzati has so benevolently promoted, just as if he were also a reform Socialist * * * during that Sunday rest which the Chamber and Senate will concede to them * * * by and by, so that, by hedging and delaying the "fruit of pastime" may grow. The class conscious proletariat should, therefore, have to share the illusions of those government employes of all stations and kinds who, in their state of political indecision, clamor and hope for some little reform that will relieve them of gloom and misery, and who receive for their political neutrality, so dear to the government, nothing but plenty of promises, especially on the eve of administrative or political elections, while they are feeding in the meantime * * * on the "fruit of pastime," until they acquire the sense and the courage to organize for their own class interests.

"Far away and antiquated" seems rather the spirit of combativeness in the Socialist party, if we judge only by the listless attitude of the reform Socialists in the Chamber at Montecitorio, and by the editorials of our party organ, which has the ingenuity to ask the Minister to dissolve the Chamber (Avanti, May 12). To dissolve a Chamber, in which the Minister may sleep peacefully between the absence of the followers of Sonnini and the ministerialism of the Socialists! And to ask this Minister, who has done all he could do under the circumstances, * * * viz., the negative work of respecting the liberty of the people in a certain degree, but who has not done anything positive toward economic

reform, because he is not at liberty to do it himself (as it would displease the old fogies of the liberal-conservative majority), and need not be afraid that anybody else will do it in his stead.

* * *

The truth is that the Socialist party of Italy, as well as of other countries, is going through a stage of uncertainty, of trouble, of various problems, in which different lines of conduct are possible, according to the practical aims of the two tendencies which Engels himself called the right and left wing of the party. These two lines of conduct naturally undergo a thousand different modifications through personal and local variations. But the most typical may be classed under the following four heads:

Reform or Compromising Tendency	{ Absolute reformers.
	{ Moderate reformers.
Revolutionary or Uncompromising Tendency	{ Revolutionary method.
	{ Absolute and negative opposition.

When the period of self-assertion is over, during which the party is naturally compelled to a close cohesion and strictly uncompromising attitude, there follows a period of defense against the reactionary forces, which imposes less rigorous tactics and brings us unavoidably into a defensive alliance with the popular parties.

With the victory of the latter comes the time of normal life, of freedom of association, of the press, of speech, of the ballot, of strikes, and the addition of more intensive parliamentary and municipal activity.

The difference between the two tendencies cannot become manifest until this time arrives. It is conditioned on personal temperament, local environment, the spirit of combativeness, the desire to quickly and in a popular manner gain public offices or to retain them in elections, the need of a little rest, the fear of relapsing into the full brutality of repression, the want of daily intercourse with the proletariat, etc. And it is easy to give one's self up to either one of the two extremes, which are more attractive because they are simpler and less tiresome.

Either yield to the temptation of being (in the end) on the side of the liberal Minister and continuing the alliance with the popular parties in order to work for the realization of the "positive program," which is to improve the material and moral condition of the working class and give them that "bird in hand" of the "amelioration of the conditions of the working class," as Engels called it, which some people prefer to that "bird in the bush," the collective ownership of the means of production and exchange, which magnificent ideal can only be attained, according to the reformers, "in an indefinitely distant future."

Others, again, follow an impulse of psychological reaction and

fall into an absolute and negative opposition, inside and outside of parliament, just as if we were still in the middle of the storm and stress period of the party or obliged to defend the most elementary conditions of political existence. The logical consequence of this policy would be the abstention from all political and municipal activity, after the manner of the anarchists who are total abstainers in politics and prefer to leave the administration and maladministration of public affairs in the hands of the conservatives * * * who are not abstainers for a moment.

Reform Socialism and negative opposition are straight and simple lines of conduct. For this reason they are attractive, but they both have an affinity for * * * the anarchist method.

* * *

In fact, what is the essence of the great and fertile innovation of the revolutionary method of Marx and Engels, as distinguished from utopian, sentimental Socialism and from anarchism? It consists solely in the substitution of the genetic method, the investigation of causes, to the old empirical, symptomatic method, in harmony with the scientific doctrine of transformism or natural evolution.

In medical practice, it is well known, that up to the middle of the 19th century, before the clinical methods of observation and experiment were tried, diseases were diagnosed and treated only by their symptoms, their outward manifestations. The discoveries of Pasteur, e. g., and of his followers on the field, of microbe germs that cause infectious diseases led to the replacing of the symptomatic cures, which were powerless against such plagues as cholera and typhoid fever, by the elimination of the causes for the purpose of preventing disease. And surprising results were obtained in this way. It is infinitely better to build waterworks for a city suffering from typhoid fever than to increase the number of physicians for the treatment of the diseased or to open public kitchens and reduce the price of medicines.

In the treatment of the infectious disease of exploitation and misery, Marx and Engels have, therefore, said: It is useless to continue those empirical and symptomatic cures, that more or less modern and rational charity, those social reforms "for the so-called amelioration of the condition of the working class," and the like. It is necessary to eliminate the causes of poverty, and these are in the last instance found in the monopolization of the means of production and exchange by private property, that reaches its climax in that period of civilization which is characterized by bourgeois capitalism. Against this rising tide of economic slavery, human misery, and injustice, little bourgeois reforms from "public soup houses" to "charity balls," from laws on "female and child labor" to "boards of arbitration" or "Sunday rest," are as useless

as the use of anarchist violence, individual or collective, against this or that capitalist, this or that "economic tyrant," this or that "political tyrant" is senseless.

The work of the revolutionary method is much more tedious, tiresome, and complex. We must combat and eliminate the fundamental causes of poverty, instead of the more or less apparent symptoms. And as this elimination cannot be accomplished by one stroke of collective or individual violence, nor by social reform legislation, nor by a dictator's decree, we must form a clear and energetic proletarian mind and redeem it from ignorance and servility. The ideas travel in human boots, and proletarian evolution does not proceed spontaneously nor does it descend from the providential heaven of government action. It rather takes shape partly through the natural agency of economic and social phenomena and partly through the pressure of the proletarian mind itself which struggles by legal means for the realization of its revolutionary aims.

These aims are called revolutionary and cannot be called otherwise. Not because they preach the building of barricades or personal assaults, but because they aim at the complete transformation of the economic fundament of society, instead of limiting, weakening, and entangling themselves in reforms which leave the basis of private property untouched and which the ruling classes have always granted, not for our benefit, but in their own interest, for the purpose of retarding the progress of the revolutionary idea.

* * *

This, then, is the secret of the marvelous force in propaganda, organization, and discipline which the Marxian doctrine has brought to the economic and political world. And this Socialist doctrine, with its powerful method, in harmony with the whole scientific movement of the second half of the 19th century, is impregnable in its fundament and its lines of conduct, no matter what may be the stage of development of the Socialist party, be it in its period of affirmation or of normal life. Just so is the science of germ diseases impregnable and employs means which seem more tedious and less effective, but are in reality the only remedy. And this remedy, like its political corollary, is applicable to all periods of life, in times of disease as well as in normal life.

Does that mean that we should not cure the diseased or that it would not be well to have physicians and cheap medicine while we are building our water works? Certainly not. But neither should we forget to press the construction of the water works forward, just because the typhoid fever might have begun to disappear. For we must remember that the disease-breeding germs are always present in the impure water and form a constant menace to public health.

In the same way we must daily and incessantly continue the revolutionary work of giving Socialist minds to the proletarians in field and factory. For the Socialist spirit is the most revolutionary social factor. Nothing can resist this Socialist mind, neither the prejudice of reactionary violence, nor the clerical superstition, nor electoral corruption, nor economic servility. It signifies a veritable rebirth of humanity, elevating them from the abjectness of brute animals to the dignity of free citizens and class conscious workingmen.

For the growth of this irresistible force, the modest and unknown, but continuous and fertile, work of our comrades in the family, the workshop, the field, the barracks, the school, and everywhere else is as necessary, or even more so, as the more apparent work of the prominent agitators and organizers who carry "the good message" far and wide. That this force of our agitation is really irresistible, I have observed and am still observing in frequent cases. In the southern provinces of Italy, e. g., the scarcity of the industrial proletariat and the deplorable lack of class consciousness among the rural proletariat might have made any attempt to form a Socialist party and awaken a sense of self-reliance among them appear as utopian. And I remember that Turati wrote about two or three years ago in the "Critica Sociale," I was a great optimist, but a poor marxist, when I predicted a development of the Socialist party also in the South. Forgetting all about the agricultural proletariat and thinking only of the industrial proletariat in Milan, he contended that there was no proletariat in southern Italy. Now, the natural protoplasm of the Socialist party is certainly the proletariat, and where this does not exist the Socialist party may be not so much what I would here call the political future of the small bourgeoisie, as the expression of discontent and revolt against want. But is this protoplasm missing in the South? The first disciples of Marx in Italy, remaining in their studies, forgot that in many parts of southern Italy the place of the industrial proletariat is taken by a numerous rural proletariat which is as free from all political prejudices dating from 1848 as from the idea of abstention from political action, and endowed with a surprising natural intelligence. It is this agricultural proletariat which, by the help of our uncompromising revolutionary method created within a few years the most splendid center of Socialism in the province of Mantua, the kernel of those "Leagues of Amelioration" among the farm laborers which are now extending their organizations throughout Italy, to the admiration of the Socialists in other countries and the discomfiture of those rural swindlers who so long played the confidence game with the simple-minded mass of our farmers.

We have only to continue pertinaciously this assiduous work

of agitation and organization, and we shall see unexpected results. If we do so, we shall find that these same little bourgeois, artisans and small proprietors, whom we generally declare to find their natural expression in the radical parties, will join the Socialist party faster than we anticipate. For these middle classes must perceive that, in the words of Gatti, they can most efficiently promote their interests by Socialist labor politics, because their economic life consists of three-fourth labor and one-fourth capital. The old capitalist parties cannot do any decisive and thorough work for them, because they are individualistic in the bourgeois sense and leave private property untouched, which is the fundamental cause of the exploitation and poverty of the laborers and the miserable condition of the little bourgeois.

* * *

But while we continue this monotonous, tedious, little esthetic and less attractive work which does not shine so brilliantly as the variations of comparative legislation, does that imply that we are to oppose and neglect reforms which may improve the conditions of the working class? That would be absurd! The force of circumstances compels us, therefore, to vote for social reform, though it may remain ineffective, rather than unite with the reaction and bring it to fall. However little such a law may be worth in practice, it would be absurd to oppose it by following a line of absolutely negative opposition. However little a cheapening of the price of medicine may help to cure a disease, it would be nonsense to oppose it. The essential thing is not to become infatuated with such symptomatic measures and to remember that the best remedy against typhoid fever is the building of waterworks, even though the work of carrying a few stones and a few water pipes every day may be monotonous, tiresome, and the completion in the far future. And it is also essential not to forget, that the lowering of the price of medicine, e. g., by the municipality, is not done purely from a philanthropic motive, but also from an egoistic class interest. For it is also in the interest of the rich to weaken the violence of an epidemic, for the purpose of increasing their own chances of escaping with their lives. And it is the same philanthropy (* * * of egoism) which impels them to give the millions (* * * of the people) for the canalization of the great cities from which they derive their robber profits and a decrease of the danger of infection from epidemic and endemic diseases, which easily spread from the slums and moss-grown hovels to the palaces.

Our reform-loving comrades should, therefore, remember that the capitalists will also grant reform laws, and have passed them in other countries, without our help and in their own interest for the purpose of reaction and delay, as long as they are compelled

by the fear of the revolutionary spirit of the oppressed classes. Germany is a case in point, where the great promoter of social reform was—Bismarck. And it may even happen that the capitalists, more farseeing than their opponents, think of preventing the growth of the revolutionary spirit by offering the bait of "immediate demands," as in England. The difference is only, that the revolutionary method followed by the German Socialist party put the proletariat on the alert against that reform legislation, however wonderful it may be, while the capitalists in England commenced their social reform before the formation of a revolutionary party took place and thus rendered the gigantic corporative trade unions politically and socially flaccid.

In both cases this is equivalent to confirming that the most efficient, useful, and practical policy for the proletariat is the revolutionary method of Socialist agitation and organization which does not prevent, but promotes reform, without stifling or paralyzing the potent aspirations for the complete emancipation of the proletariat.

* * *

And now, once more and for ever, our obstinate conclusion: There is room within the Socialist party for all, whatever may be their line of conduct. From the monosyllabic uncompromising element to the confirmed reformers, every one fulfills a certain function which is not wholly lost. Only we believe that the latter are making a bad use of their energy. They are expending 100 parts of strength to obtain one part of results. But should the example of England, Germany, Belgium, where they have had that vaunted social legislation for half a century—for which we are still clamoring—teach us nothing? Cannot we see that the virus of misery and exploitation has not in the least diminished in those countries, despite half a century of social reforms? What better proof of the eternal illusion of symptomatic remedies do we need?

The revolutionary method does not neglect the defense of former conquests or the gradual realization of reforms. But in aiming more at causes than at symptoms, it insists above all on the formation of the consciousness of the ultimate and definite goal. Therefore it is a more complex and more tiresome method, and more often very monotonous, because it involves us less in the multi-colored bourgeois schemes and leaves us more in contact with the ragged jackets of the laborers.

But the revolutionary method alone creates and strengthens the inexhaustible energy which enforces all social progress. By force of experience, which is more persuasive than our polemics, it will finally be triumphantly accepted, in Italy as elsewhere, by the common consent of the Socialist proletariat.

ENRICO FERRI.

(Translated by Ernest Untermann.)

Terrorism in Russia.

THE following is a translation of a leading article from "Iskra"—the Spark— of May 1, 1902. "Iskra" is the organ of the Russian Social democratic party. It is published under-ground fashion. The article defines the attitude of the party toward "terrorism," which shows signs of revival.

"Death of Sipiaguine* and Our Problems of Agitation."

The brilliant official career of Sipiaguine has been suddenly interrupted. The man, who during thirty months held in his hands nearly the whole executive power of the Russian Empire, and who cruelly abused that power, has fallen a victim to his reactionary zeal. Our "guardians"** lament bitterly over his death, and cast thunders of indignation at the poor head of his young "assassin." And a considerable part of the bourgeois press of Europe echoes them.

We are not surprised either at the European bourgeois nor at the Russian "guardians." As is well known, our reactionary party is of the firm belief that it is its right and even its duty to destroy life, but it views every answer by violence to its violence as a great crime. As far as the European bourgeoisie is concerned, it has long outlived its high aspirations and has become the guardian of "order." The Russian students who raise their arms against the brutal opritsniki*** of the autocracy of All Russias arouse not sympathy but terror in the bourgeoisie of Europe; recall to it not the Brutuses, but the Tropmans. Their deeds of courage and self-sacrifice appear to the bourgeois as a flagrant violation of the rights of man. As a humane guardian of these rights, the European bourgeois considers the use of arms justifiable only for conquest of new markets or for quelling workingmen who attempt to throw off the yoke of capital. The unbearable condition of Russian youth is to him of far less interest than the sad fate of the French and Belgian capital invested in the steel industries of South Russia. For where your treasure is, there is your heart.

In the death of Sipiaguine is guilty, before everything else, the reactionary clique to which he belonged to the end of his days, and which answered with repressive violence to all ordinary and necessary demands of the students. The moral responsibility for these daily and nightly official thuggisms falls mainly on

*Sipiaguine was Minister of Education and was killed by Balamshoff. Trans.

**A term denoting those who "rally" round the throne. Trans.

***A personal guard of John the Terrible, infamous in history for their brutality. Trans.

Sipiaguine himself. It appeared as if he had it for his object to show to all who could see that the "heartfelt care" of the government of the Czar for the studying youth is one of the most "senseless illusions"* of our crowned, overgrown infant.

Is it surprising that he had to answer for it?

Let then the Ciceros of reaction thunder against his "murderer." No one among us will be misled by their groans of indignation. Russian public opinion is again living through that opposition mood through which it once passed about twenty years ago, and to which was then due its sympathy with the terrorism of the People's party.

Every honest man is sick to death of the pernicious police-given "order," and no honest and thinking man will shed tears over the fatal end of the pillars and guardians of this "order."

"Killing is no murder!" wrote an English patriot of the seventeenth century, when Cromwell usurped the political power which was conquered by the revolutionary party. Killing is no murder—will many Russians now say with full conviction. One need not be an "irreconcilable" in order to see the deep and wide wide chasm which separates a Karpowitch or a Balamasheff from an ordinary murderer. Killing is not murder! The consciousness of this truth is now so widespread in Russia that it begins to threaten with serious danger our liberating movement. This sounds paradoxical, but every one who studies our modern conditions must agree with it.

The priests of the official Moloch are doing their utmost to bring the liberty-minded class of Russia to the highest degree of exasperation. When the provocation reaches the extreme degree, the thought of struggle by terrorism is arising of itself wherever the proportionate relation of social forces excludes the plan of an open, armed revolt of the masses. And where,—as with us now,—such thought found expression in practical deeds, and where,—as in modern Russia,—such deeds meet with warm approval in the wide strata of society, there "terrorism" aspires to become the dominating method of revolutionary struggle, crowding to the rear all other methods.

Signs of such tendencies become apparent even in our Social Democratic party. It is being remarked by some Social Democrats that demonstrations are being paid for too high, and that the practice of "terrorism" would bring us to our purpose much sooner. The experience of the seventies has shown us that such talk leads to the thought of "systematic terror." And therein lies the great danger to our liberating movement. Should this movement adopt the practice of "terror," it will thereby undermine its own strength.

*Evidently referring to the words used by the Czar. Trans.

This strength consists in the fact that the idea of political liberty, which once attracted only the educated class, has now penetrated into several strata of the working class. The conscious part of the proletariat is now the most reliable fighter for political liberty. It is because the student is now supported by the workingman that the agitation of the studying youth has acquired such great significance. This is well understood by the students who deliberately come into closer relation with the proletariat. The students have a clear idea of the decisive political significance of the proletarian army.

But it is well known that the methods of warfare by each army are largely determined by its composition. The composition of the proletarian army is such that for it demonstrations and all sorts of public mass movements are the easiest and most practical method of warfare. Terrorism may be used by the proletariat under rarest and most exceptional circumstances. Under our present conditions, terrorism would lead to the result that some persons or groups would come out of the proletarian army and become segregated, together with the terrorists from the educated class, the mass of the workingmen ever growing less active, with the result that the work of political enlightenment of the working class will have been neglected, if it will not have ceased altogether, and the fall of autocracy will have a long postponement.

Stepan Chalturin, one of the most energetic, experienced and enlightened representatives of the working class, was one of the most determined opponents of terrorism, precisely on the ground that terrorism interferes with the organization, and consequently with the political enlightenment of the workingmen. True, he has later become a terrorist, but not because he has found his former views erroneous, but because the organization of the workingmen ceased to appear to him as suffering of no postponement; he came to the conviction that the death of Alexander II. will bring about a constitutional government and political liberty, when the work of political education of the workingmen could go ahead much faster. With such convictions, he could consistently prefer the terroristic propaganda activity. But such views are impossible now. Experience has proven them to be erroneous. Czar Alexander II. fell; czarism continues its existence. To destroy czarism, it is necessary to destroy its foundation. To this object there is no other way but the political enlightenment of the people, and the working class before all.

It is said that terrorism is also educating the working class by arousing it. The proposition contains an element of truth. The workingmen, discontented by the existing order of things, rejoice at the successful attempts and regret the unsuccessful. But such agitation cannot even be remotely compared with an agitation

aroused in the workingmen by a personal and immediate participation in the public mass movements. In the last case, the agitation predisposes to a self-reliance, where mere sympathy with the terrorists not only does not exclude a passive attitude to public life, but sustains and strengthens it, by accustoming the population to regard the revolutionary party as a beneficent, but foreign, force, which alone will achieve all, alone will rout all the foes of liberty, alone secure the triumph of the revolution.

Terrorism Isolates the Revolutionary Party and Thereby Leads it to Defeat.

That demonstrations cost us too many victims is, to our sorrow, indisputable. But, first, it is a mistake to think that terroristic activity costs less in this respect. On the contrary. The greatest losses to the revolutionists are occasioned by such activity. Second, no struggle is possible without sacrifice. Sacrifices were and will be brought. The point is that they are not brought in vain, so that each demonstration may bring to the cause all the benefit which it can bring.

Already in No. 14 of "Iskra" have we pointed out what our demonstrations lack: 1. Comparatively few people participate in them. 2. The participants do not show organized resistance to the authorities. Experience has proven that we were not mistaken. Take the Kieff demonstration of Feb. 2. The participants have shown a truly heroic courage and self-sacrifice. But they were comparatively few, and the police overcame them easily. But this is not all. Even those, comparatively small forces which participated in the demonstration were not organized, which still more weakened their resistance. On the other hand, see what happened in Helsingfors on April 5. There, according to foreign newspapers, the police met with organized resistance on the part of the "mob" and were compelled to retreat, carrying away many wounded. And this was achieved without the use by the participants in the demonstration of firearms, which would have been harmful, as it would have given to the government the desired pretext of "subduing of the rebels" by the bullets of the soldiery. We do not know whether the Helsingfors demonstration of April 5 was planned. Apparently, it was. In any case there is no doubt that its success was due to a simultaneous activity of a great mass of people. The police and the Cossacks were attacked from all sides. Stones, sticks and bottles full of acids were thrown at them even from the windows. The government saw that it had against itself the population and it retreated, postponing the call of the conscripts. In our times the secret of political success lies in the art of arousing the movement of masses. When the idea of political liberty will take possession of all our laboring masses, as it has of some of its parts, then will we have dem-

onstrations like that of Helsingfors. And in order that this idea may take possession of all our laboring masses, it must be spread with ten-fold energy. Russia must be inundated with leaflets and proclamations showing the vileness of our political system. Such leaflets and appeals must be distributed in shops, restaurants, public baths, cars, churches, inns, railways, steamers, in one word—everywhere. Each public movement must be preceded by preparatory work of agitation and organization. Where such conditions are not complied with, it is better to abstain from demonstrations. But all the more determined must be the action where the ground was prepared for a demonstration.

The disappointment of those who considered last year's events as "the beginning of the end" is very natural. The end is still not "finished." But with us illusions are not less harmful than lukewarmness, with which, by the way, they are closely related. We are living not through the "beginning of the end, but simply through the beginning." No wonder, therefore, that the end makes us wait; but we shall never see it if we abandon the path of political agitation in the masses and turn to terrorism.

Killing is no murder! But neither is it the road to victory; while punishing single servants of the Czar, it does not destroy czarism. We esteem highly the self-sacrifice of persons like Balmasheff and Karpovitch. But our object is the overthrow of the whole system. We reason from the point of view of a class. From this point of view the truest, the most effective means of struggle with czarism was and remains agitation in the working class for the purpose of developing its political self-consciousness and organization of its forces for further, ever more stubborn, ever deeper penetrating, ever more fruitful and triumphant propaganda.

The edifice of Russian political liberty can be erected only on the foundation of political self-consciousness of the Russian proletariat. The Russian revolutionary movement will triumph as a movement of the laboring masses or it will not triumph at all.

Translated by Henry L. Slobodin.

Socialist Agitation Among Farmers in America,

THE United States are to-day certainly the most important and interesting of all civilized countries. Not England, but America, shows us our future to-day, so far as any country can show another's future, considering that every country has its own peculiar development. Capitalism makes its greatest progress in America. There it reigns with the most unlimited brutality and carries the class antagonisms to a climax. And at the same time this tendency toward sharper class antagonisms is forced on other countries through the intensification of competition, or rather this tendency, already present in all countries, is accentuated by American competition.

While in the middle of the last century it was necessary to study England in order to understand the tendencies of modern capitalism, our knowledge on this subject to-day must be derived from America. At the same time it is even possible to learn more about the essence of the latest phase of capitalism in Germany than in England. In the latter country it is most disguised by traditions, while this is least the case in America. Germany stands also in this respect between these two great representatives of capitalist rule as it does in regard to the rapidity of its development.

The future which America shows us would be very cheerless if it did not reveal at the same time a growth of the Socialist movement. Nowhere are all the means of political power so shamelessly purchaseable as in America: administration, popular representation, courts, police and press; nowhere are they so directly dependent on the great capitalists. And nowhere is it more apparent than there that a proletariat with a Socialist conscience is the only means of saving the nation, which is falling even faster into complete servitude to the great capitalists than they are able to subjugate foreign countries.

So far the success of the American Socialists has not been very encouraging. It seemed almost as if there were something in the character of the Anglo-Saxon race which made them immune against the "poison of Socialism." In a certain sense this is actually true. The Anglo-Saxon is of an eminently practical nature. He prefers inductive reasoning in science to the deductive method, and keeps as much as possible out of the way of generalizing statements. In politics he only approaches problems that promise immediate success, and he prefers to overcome arising difficulties as he meets them instead of penetrating to the bottom of them. It would be an interesting study to find out whether this character is

inherited and how much of it is acquired. I am inclined to think that it is largely due to the fact that in England the bourgeoisie became the ruling class earlier than anywhere else, for its manner of reasoning as a class corresponds to the English character. The thoughts and feelings of the bourgeoisie have nowhere become so national in scope as in England since the sixteenth century. That this is a social, not a natural, phenomenon is further substantiated by the fact that the whole Anglo-Saxon world combines with this practical sense a religious turn of mind that is not equaled anywhere in the world. In general, it is true that religiousness is greater in Protestant than in Catholic countries. The abolition of the celibate has probably much to do with this. In Catholic countries the clergy does not propagate itself legitimately. New life comes to the Catholic clergy only from the rest of society, to-day mostly from the economically most backward classes. Hence they cease to play a role in the intellectual life of the nation. But the Protestant clergymen generate a large offspring, which are a considerable factor in bourgeois intelligence. Thanks to this circumstance the Protestant clergymen are not only on the whole more intelligent than the Catholic clergy, but their sons also take up science and carry into it the religious sentiment of their fathers. In Catholic countries, religion and science are strictly separated, even in the persons of their representatives. The Protestant clergymen arrive at a certain conciliation of religion and science by dint of which they sometimes narrow the one, while giving a longer lease of life to the other.

In England there is, besides, the additional circumstance that religion was still the ruling mode of thought at the time when the bourgeois revolution took place. On the continent, the fight between the revolutionary and reactionary classes took place in the eighteenth and the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century in the form of an enlightenment against religion. In England, it was fought in the seventeenth century in the form of the struggle of one religious sect against another.

The emigrants carried the peculiar Anglo-Saxon mode of thought along with them across the ocean. They did not find anything on the other side that could have shaken them in their views. No class free from the work for a living was formed that could have cultivated arts and sciences for their own sake. We only find farmers and city dwellers whose maxim was that of the home country : Time is Money.

This also became the principle of the gradually arising proletariat for the simple reason that they did not feel as a proletariat, but considered their position only as a stage of transition for the purpose of becoming farmers, capitalists or at least lawyers, which was not unusual for many decenniums. To make money, in order

to escape from their class, that was the ruling passion of the proletariat.

But even when a permanent proletariat arose, in which born Americans began to take their places by the side of foreign immigrants and negroes, the Anglo-Saxons still remained "practical politicians." They did, indeed, begin to understand that they must go into politics for themselves, but like true practical politicians, they demanded that it should be a shortsighted policy which should take heed only of the moment and regard it more practical to run after a bourgeois swindler who promises real successes for tomorrow, instead of standing by a party of their own class which is honest enough to confess that it has nothing but struggles and sacrifices in store for the next future, and which declares it to be foolish to expect to reap immediately after sowing.

If at any time Anglo-American workingmen had come to the conclusion that they must keep clear of the old capitalist parties, then this ill-starred "practical" sense would mislead them into founding a party on some single issue which was supposed to cure at once all evils, free silver, single tax, or the like. But when this agitation did not bring any immediate success, then the masses soon tired of it, and the movement which had grown up overnight collapsed quickly. Only the workingmen of German origin kept a Socialist movement alive among their countrymen. However, such a movement of immigrants could never hope to become a serious political factor. And as this emigration from Germany decreased considerably (the number of emigrants to the United States was 216,089 in 1881, while in 1899 it only reached 19,016), and as the Germans in America soon became anglicized, this German Socialist propaganda not only made no progress, but actually fell off after a certain time.

Though the German Socialist movement in America is thus declining, it nevertheless has not been in vain. For to it is due the existence of a growing Anglo-American movement for Socialism which aims higher, develops the theoretical understanding of the class struggle, and, standing on a solid basis, is rising steadily and irrepressibly.

This progress is not so rapid as that of the prior Anglo-American movements; e. g., the Greenback movement, Kearney's California Workingmen's party, 1878-79; the Henry George episode, 1886-87; Bellamyism and Populism in the beginning of the '90s. But we may regard this as a good sign, for a mushroom growth was hitherto always followed by a rapid dissolution.

The new Anglo-American Social Democracy is not yet ten years old. It dates from the last crisis. We may regard the great Pullman strike of 1894, which was led so brilliantly by Eugene V. Debs, as the date of its birth. True, that strike ended in de-

feat, but it was a very honorable defeat after a protracted struggle, in which nothing was left untried to vanquish a superior enemy in a fight that excited and shook the Union to its foundations. Since then Debs and his friends have developed into class-conscious Socialists, mainly under the influence of German Socialist elements, and their influence on the working class is growing from day to day.

Just while I am writing these lines, the American party press reaches me with the news that the conventions of the Western Federation of Labor, the Western Federation of Miners, and the United Association of Hotel and Restaurant Employes, numbering together 150,000 members, have adopted the platform of the Socialist party in Denver, Colo.

The rise of a Socialist literature is no less cheering than that of the Socialist organizations. Numerous weeklies in the English language are at the disposal of the party, and a daily is planned in New York. Our American comrades also have an illustrated family paper, "The Comrade," and a scientific review, "THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW," appearing monthly at 56 Fifth avenue, Chicago, Ill., which contains articles of great merit.

The new Anglo-American movement also begins to develop its own scientific literature, which stands above the Utopian stage of a Bellamy and Laurence Gronlund and accepts the fact of the class struggle.

A welcome beginning of such a literature is the book on the American Farmer by A. M. Simons, the editor of the above named INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. It is characteristic that the recent Anglo-American Socialism first endeavors to stand on its own feet in the agrarian question.

The industrial conditions may be understood in a general way by the help of the German Marxian literature. For this purpose, translations are sufficient. But the agrarian conditions of America are very peculiar. Not the least peculiarity is the fact that the United States, in spite of their highly developed industrial capitalism, are a strongly agrarian country, which exports a surplus of farm products and in which the majority of the population are farmers. Every Anglo-American labor movement which pretended to be an independent movement therefore sought from the beginning the support of the farmers and found it. This was the case with the Greenbackers in the '70s, with the followers of Henry George in the '80s, the Populists in the '90s. The attitude of the Socialist party toward the farmers is, therefore, one of the most important problems which occupy the young Socialist branch of the Anglo-American labor movement.

The work of Simons is especially well done on the descriptive side. Briefly and yet graphically he draws the picture of agricul-

ture in the different parts of the Union, the variations of which are much greater than e. g. than in the different parts of Germany, for the climatic and historical differences are far greater. The German Empire extends over nine degrees of latitude, from the forty-seventh to the fifty-sixth degree, while the American Union covers twenty-five degrees, from the twenty-fourth to the forty-ninth degree of latitude. In the German Empire the German farm element rules, grown out of the mark commune. In the United States we find the remains of the Spanish latifundian system grafted upon the Indian barbarism, the plantation system built on the slavery of negroes, furthermore the transitory phenomenon of the bonanza farms, of the wheat factories, based on superficial cultivation and exploitation of labor. Finally, we find the cultivation of arid lands by the help of irrigation as the last and most promising phase of agriculture. Every one of these systems of cultivation develops its own peculiar social forms and problems.

Simons adds to this description a series of searching analyses of the influence of industrial development on agriculture. He shows that agriculture is not stationary, that the law of increasing control by great capitalist interests is also felt in this field, only in another form than in industries. The development in agriculture takes place in such a way that the various functions of agriculture are transferred one by one to great capitalist concerns by the help of modern technical improvements. In this way these functions cease to be agricultural and become industrial.

The rest of agriculture which has not yet become industrialized exhibits few signs of vitality and becomes ever more dependent on the transportation companies and the great capitalist industries which alone render its products available for the consumer.

Analogous to my own view, then, Simons sees in the progressive industrialization of agriculture its peculiar advance on the way of progress.

And although he recognizes that the small farmer is by no means threatened with rapid extinction, yet he does not sing the praise of the little farm, being conscious of its waste of energy and technical backwardness.

America is the land of agricultural machinery, but nevertheless Simons emphasizes that the value of farm machinery does not grow. He quotes an article from the Yearbook of the Agricultural Department, according to which the average value of farm implements and machinery amounted to \$111 in 1870, \$101 in 1880, and \$108 in 1890. He sees the cause of this stagnation in the poverty of the farmers and in the impossibility of employing machinery to good effect on their small farms. On the other hand, he shows that the great number of the latest machines, especially those

driven by steam, become too big to be owned and used by the single farmer. In consequence these machines become the property of capitalists who rent them to farmers, as is done in Germany; e. g., with the threshing machine.

At the same time, mortgages and tenantry are progressing. In the dry belt the farmers are becoming more and more dependent on the great companies that own the irrigation systems.

These are the means by which the property of the farmers in the tools of agricultural production are being more and more restricted and concentrated in the hands of capitalist exploiters. The small farmers are not displaced by mammoth farms, but they become more and more dependent on great capitalist concerns. The social condition of the farmer approaches ever more that of the sweating boss in industry. He is not yet a wage worker, but he ceases to be an independent producer.

His relation to the proletariat and the Socialist party corresponds to this intermediate position. It is not clear or easily interpreted, and largely dependent on local and temporal peculiarities. Nevertheless, Simons emphasizes energetically the necessity and possibility of winning the farmer for the Socialist party.

This question is one of the most difficult and disputed in our party. I would not assent without reservation to those parts of Simons' book which are devoted to this subject.

Simons points out, e. g., that the industrial laborers make up only 25 per cent of the voters, while the farmers make up 40 per cent., so that none of the two parties could conquer the political powers by itself. This sort of argument would hold good only then when it were a question of gaining political ascendancy tomorrow. But Comrade Simons will hardly think of doing that. At present it is not a question of winning the political power, but of taking root in the popular mind. For this purpose the industrial proletariat is certainly better fitted than the farming population. To agitate among farmers when the mass of the city workers are still strangers to Socialism is equivalent to bringing rocky soil under cultivation at great expense and leaving fertile soil untouched from lack of labor power.

How the proportion of the two camps will be when the American Socialist party will be strong enough to risk the fight for political power, we do not know. In Simons' book we find remarkable figures to show how rapidly the city population in the United States is increasing relatively and absolutely. He gives the following tables:

	City population.	Rural. population.	Number of city people in 10,000 in- habitants.
1820.....	475,135	9,158,687	493
1850.....	2,897,586	20,294,290	1,249
1870.....	8,071,875	30,486,496	2,093
1890.....	18,284,385	44,337,865	2,920

However, the proportion between industrial and rural population changes very much in favor of the former, if we observe the various States by themselves. I use for this purpose the statistics of trades of 1890, which I happen to have on hand. According to these statistics, 44.8 per cent of the male population above 10 years of age were employed in agriculture (including fisheries and mining), while industries employed 21.59 per cent, transportation 16.46 per cent, personal service 14.31 per cent, free arts 21.67 per cent. But in the Northeastern States agriculture employed only 22.46 per cent, while industries employed 35.31 per cent and transportation 21.67 per cent. These two categories, then, are already in the majority in the Northeast. In the Southern States the proportion is reversed. Agriculture is supreme down there. It comprises in the Atlantic States 60.32 per cent of the male producers, while industries employ only 13.35 per cent and transportation 11.98 per cent. The Central States show a still greater disproportion, with 68.05 per cent in agriculture, 9.08 in industries, and 10.24 in transportation. The largest agrarian population is in the State of Mississippi, where agriculture employs 80.11 per cent, industries only an insignificant 4.83 per cent. But these are just the States in which mortgage slavery and tenantry, which require the addition of wages, are most widespread. Of the 1,836,372 farms in these States, 706,343, or 38 per cent, were rented in 1890, while only 18 per cent were rented in the Northeastern States, and 28 per cent in the total Union. In this respect, and in the general lack of cultivation, the Southern States compare with the south of Italy. While the number of illiterates above 10 years of age in the Northeastern States was 6.21 per cent in 1890, it was 40.29 per cent in the Southern Atlantic States and 39.54 per cent in the central States of the South. In these States the negroes outnumber the rest of the producers, especially in agriculture. In 1890 there were 3,409,860 colored people to a white farming population of 2,355,570.

I am convinced that Comrade Simons will not anticipate any considerable success from our agitation among the farming population of the South. They are the people from which we have least of all to expect, as regards understanding and regular participa-

tion in the class struggle of the industrial proletariat. They may be ripe for a revolt of desperation, and when the proletariat will seize the political power in the industrial districts, the oppressed farmers in the South will not oppose them and will help in their own way. But it seems to me impossible to found a permanent party organization with them.

Hence only the farmers of the Middle West and the Northwest remain. Their number is not insignificant, for they comprise nearly half of all the farms (in 1890, 2,069,700 out of a total of 4,564,641). Their rural population is still very strong, relatively speaking. The percentage of producers above 10 years of age was 47.42 in the States of the Middle West, and 36.28 in the Northwestern States. At the same time, the industrial population, which is not inconsiderable (19.28 and 28.82 per cent), offers favorable opportunities for Socialist propaganda. Strong and independent they are, and not only free from the barbarism, but also from the corruption of the East. In Europe, during the '70s and '80s, it was not the economically highly developed England, but the more backward Germany which offered the best opportunities for the development of an independent labor party. Similarly, it may be left for the States of the West and Middle West to out-march the more highly developed Eastern States in this respect. For those States, then, it becomes imperative to define our position toward the farmers; that is, toward those owners of middle-sized and large farms who are living on the proceeds of their lands. In the following remarks I am referring only to this class of farmers, not to the very small farmers and farmhands, nor to the great land owners who manage their farms on a purely capitalist scale. Our position toward these is perfectly clear, only that toward the farmer proper requires definition.

The success of our propaganda among them will depend above all on the end for which we are striving. If we should aim to draw them into our movement in masses, I am afraid we should not accomplish much good.

Comrade Simons shows convincingly how much the farmer has to gain by voting for Socialism. His remarks on the prospects of American agriculture are very fascinating and make one of the most interesting passages of his book. They have a refreshing effect after the narrowness of view to which some people are trying to accustom us at present. But we have not yet reached the stage where we can bring Socialism into practical application, and especially the practical farmer will not show any enthusiasm for the society of the future, until it will have become the society of the present. It is the class struggle of the present which forms parties and keeps them together. But in this struggle the farmers have different interests than the industrial laborers.

A comrade who thought he knew how to handle the farmers once ridiculed our city agitators who were foolish enough to speak to the farmers of the eight-hour day and similar matters. That, he said, was the way to deter them. That was correct, yet that comrade was not making a point against the "foolish" agitators, but against his pet idea of winning the farmers for our party. True, the farmer has no sympathy for the eight-hour day and labor protection. He does not only assume an attitude of indifference, but of hostility toward them. He is obliged to work from early dawn to the dark of night, sometimes sixteen to eighteen hours, and the city workers would only render eight hours of much lighter labor. And how is he going to hold on to his men, if wages rise in the city and the hours of labor are shortened?

This contrast is also felt in America. An article in the May number of the INTERNATIONALIST SOCIALIST REVIEW, "A Farmers' Criticism of the Socialist Party," is very significant. The writer, J. B. Webster, has formerly played a role in the Populist party. This party has had a short run, and the old parties, says Webster, satisfy the working class in the city and country less and less. They are looking for a new party. In view of this condition of the minds, the Socialist party might well count on having success among the farmers, but it would have to give up its character as a mere workingmen's party. The interests of the farmers are said not to be those of the wage workers. Shortening of the hours of labor and increasing the wages may be very well for the wage worker, but for the farmer this would mean an increase of cost of production. Whoever wishes to win the farmer must, therefore, not speak of shortening working hours and increasing wages. But everybody can imagine how trusty those party members will be who can only be won by concealing the main essence of our present day's work from them.

There are, furthermore, antagonisms between the proletarians and the owners of middle-sized and large farms not alone in workingmen's politics, but also in general politics, that make a permanent amalgamation of them in the same party impossible. True, both are antagonists of capital. But there are many ways of fighting it. It may be forced beyond itself or the attempt may be made to drive it back. The first is the proletarian method, the second that of the bourgeois farmer.

However much the proletariat may be oppressed by the great capitalist mode of production, still his condition improves with the growth and technical improvement of the industrial plants. For small and technically backward concerns can carry on the competitive struggle only at the expense of their employes. The great capitalist mode of production, which forms the basis for the emancipation of the working class, is even at present the most favorable

for the workers, wherever it is in competition with small concerns. The little bourgeois Socialism which does not comprehend this simply attributes the Socialist preference for production on a large scale to a dogmatic fanaticism which feels obliged to repeat blindly the marxian formulas. But strange to say, we find the same preference among the English trade unions to which even the most obstinate revisionist will hardly attribute any marxian dogmatism. (See Webb, *Theory and Practice of English Trade Unions*, II., page 86 and following.)

The position of the wage workers in the present reacts on their attitude toward the development of the future. They expect their emancipation only from the progress over and beyond the present. They are progressive even there, where they do not show any class consciousness and do not give any thought to Socialism, as e. g., in England. They may be politically ignorant or indifferent, and may permit themselves to be used for reactionary purposes, but they will never consciously strive for any reactionary measure.

Not so the farmers. The whole development tends to undermine their existence. It is not extinguished, but becomes ever more dependent on capital. They have nothing to expect from economic development, but much to fear, and, therefore, they are facing it suspiciously or even with hostility and they are easily won by reactionary aims. This is true, not for Europe alone. The American farmer of the North is more intelligent and less burdened with traditions than the European farmer. But the American farmer's organizations, the Grangers and the Farmers' Alliance, show a fatal likeness to the German "Bund der Landwirthe." Both of those American organizations failed after a mighty prosperity. The causes of their failure are correctly summed up by Simons in the sentence that "nearly everything these parties sought to accomplish was in opposition to the direction of social advance." (Page 143.) But this was not only due to their ignorance, but especially to the direction of the class interests which they served.

A new attempt to unite large farmers and proletarians in the same party would end the same way as the Greenback and the Populist movement, or, what is more likely, will fail in the outset.

This is not saying that we should not take notice of the farmers. The Socialist party must not only win new party members, but its activity must touch all social phases, and it must define its position toward every class in society. The agrarian questions are too important to be passed in silence, for, in spite of all technical revolutions, agriculture remains the basis of our existence. And the farmers are too powerful as a class to be indifferent to their antagonism. But though different interests may divide the proletariat and the farmers, which make it impossible to unite them in

the same party forever, still they have many points of agreement as against other classes that make a temporary alliance not only possible, but also desirable. And a great many antagonisms are really founded on prejudice and may be overcome by enlightenment. Not party membership, but a better understanding of our aims and a temporary alliance, that may be gained by our agitation among farmers. Indeed, situations may arise, in which it will be very valuable to have them as our allies. Agitation among farmers in this sense, wherever conditions seem favorable, is not only worth considering, but very desirable, providing it is not carried on at the expense of the industrial and rural wage workers.

Conditions in America are much more favorable for such an agitation among farmers than in Germany. In industrial Europe we have the great antagonism between the consumers of foodstuffs or raw material and the farmers as the producers. It does not matter whether they sell grain, wine, butter, hops, or cattle. They are all interested in high prices, while the proletarians want low prices. This antagonism is sharply marked in Europe.

In America, however, it is less clearly apparent. The American farmer is largely dependent on export for the sale of his products. The prices which he receives are not fixed in the local, but in the world market. On the other hand, farmers and wage workers have to-day the same interest in free trade. The protective tariff on industrial products increases the cost of production for the farmer, and the industrial laborer has nothing to gain from a protective tariff. Industry does not need any more protection. Only the most dangerous antagonists of the proletariat, the cartels and trusts, are favored by it. In Europe, the tariff policy of farmers and wage workers is antagonistic. But in America farmers and farseeing Socialist wage workers follow the same tariff policy.

Besides being less antagonistic to one another as consumers and producers than their European colleagues, the American farmers and wage workers have a common enemy who is missing in Germany: the railroads. In Germany the railroads are overwhelmingly state property, but in America the privately owned railroads are the most powerful means for the exploitation of the farmers by the capitalists. And the owners of the railroads are the same men who are standing opposed to the railroad employes and the iron workers, the two most important branches of labor. The nationalization of the railroads is, therefore, a measure which is for the interest of both classes. The realization of this demand could, however, become very dangerous, if it were not at the same time accompanied by a thorough reform of state and federal administrations. As long as the present corruption continues in these bodies, as long as all public offices are regarded as spoils of the victorious party for rewarding its followers, every increase

of the public funds and of public offices means an increase of the corruption fund with which the victorious party pays its voters.

But the interests of farmers and wage earners are also identical in the question of administrative reforms.

Finally the antagonism between the two classes is less pronounced in America, because wage labor plays a less important role in agriculture. In 1895 the number of independent producers in German agriculture was 2,202,227, of wage workers 5,528,708. In America the proportion was almost reversed. While the number of farmers and independent land owners was 5,281,557, there were only 3,004,061 agricultural laborers. There were, furthermore, 1,913,373 day laborers, some of whom would have to be counted as agricultural laborers. At any rate, the number of independent farmers outweighs that of the farm hands, especially in the West. In the northern part of the Middle West, e. g., we find only 778,026 farm hands to 2,284,625 farmers. While the farmers of the Union constitute 64 per cent of the total of farmers and farm hands, the proportion rises to 76 per cent in the North of the Central States. Even if we were to include all the day laborers in the farm hands, which would be exaggerating, the number of farmers in the Central North would amount to 61 per cent, in the Union to 53 per cent, while it reaches only 32 per cent in Germany.

In view of these facts we may well assume that conditions are more favorable for a temporary alliance of farmers and wage-laborers in large parts of America than in most parts of Germany. An agitation which merely aims to win the good will of the farmers and to induce them to regard us as the lesser evil as compared with the capitalist parties, may count on good results. But I should certainly regard it as a dangerous mistake to repeat the short-lived experiments of the Greenbackers, Single-Taxers, and Populists, to weld farmers and wage workers into one party, and to modify our program and tactics accordingly. However useful the first method may be, the second is certainly injurious.

Simons does not state clearly whether he recommends the first or the second method of agitation among farmers. Still we need not fear that we shall see a new edition of the second kind. J. B. Webster has already pointed out in his article that the intimate connection of the Socialist party with the trade union movement is one of the essential obstacles to an adherence of the farmers to our party. And this obstacle will hardly decrease in proportion, but rather continue to grow with the spread of the Socialist idea among the American trade unions. Not only trade unionism pure and simple has its dangers, but also party politics pure and simple. The trade unions may be guarded against dangers by the party and vice versa. The growing Socialist sentiment among the trade

unions is the best guarantee that the Socialist party and the trade unions will both keep on the right way.

Simons' book, therefore, does not indicate the beginning of a farmers' invasion into the Socialist party, but only the first step in the endeavor to bring the two classes to a better mutual understanding, seeing that they are bound to assist each other and still know very little about one another. This the book accomplishes in a very satisfactory manner. It will induce many a farmer to at least view the Socialist party without prejudice, if it does not make him a Socialist. Above all, it will have the effect to enlighten the party members on the character and tendencies of American agriculture and on the agrarian tasks of the Socialist party.

KARL KAUTSKY, in "Neue Zeit."
(Translated by Ernest Untermann.)

SOCIALISM IN AUSTRALIA.

With Special Reference to Labor in Politics in Queensland.



At the outset it may be said that conscious, avowed and organized socialism here in Australia is, as yet, confined to a comparatively small number of men and women, who have carried on Socialist propaganda within the last ten to fifteen years. Under the name of various organizations, such as the Social Democratic Federation, International Socialist Club, Socialist League and Social Democratic Vanguard, each of the six States of the Australian Commonwealth has a small band of active Socialists who, in season and out, are sowing the seeds of revolt against the economic and moral slavery of the present capitalistic era.

Whilst these active propagandists would add but an insignificant thousand or two to the total of the world's Socialist millions, they are by no means the only indication of the forces which here, too, are preparing the way for the coming of the Socialist age.

In Australia, as in England, trades unionism is the primary means of protest which labor is using against wage slavery, but with this difference, that within the last ten or twelve years it has added the use of the ballot box to the weapon of industrial organization. In Federal and State politics, a class-conscious labor party stands in opposition to all other parties.

The trades union movement on this young continent dates from about 1850. In 1856 the eight hour movement was inaugurated by the Stone Masons' Union, in Melbourne, and it soon spread throughout the building trades generally. In those days of scanty population and large natural resources labor was able to secure fairly tolerable conditions, though even then strikes had to be fought and won and lost. But as capitalism soon usurped supreme legislative power it found easy means to increase the supply of labor, and restrict its avenues, by monopolizing the land.

To withstand the constant encroachments of the exploiters it was felt that the federation of trades organizations was necessary. This important step was barely taken before the shipping masters, fearing the added strength federation would give to unionism, decided to force a conflict, and attempt to destroy the new organization before it got deeply rooted. They refused to permit the Officers' Union to join the Labor Federation. The great maritime strike, which swept over Australia in 1890, was the result. Being precipitated before the new federation was firmly established, it ended disastrously for the men.

But it was the shearers' strike in 1891 which aroused labor to

its class consciousness. The pastoralists, being well represented in the Legislature, brought the full force of government to bear on its side. Special coercive legislation was rushed through Parliament, and enforced by gatling guns and the gaol. Labor had practically no representation in 1891, and consequently was defeated. As the history of this period in the other Australian States is similar in many respects to that of Queensland, the writer, being resident in the latter State, may be permitted to refer to it at somewhat greater length.

The one great influence in directing the labor forces here into the right channels undoubtedly has been the institution of labor journalism, in conjunction with trades federation. "The Worker," owned and controlled by the unions, started life in the beginning of 1890. W. Lane, its first editor and founder (who has since become known to the reform world as the organizer of "New Australia," a communal settlement in Paraguay, South America, and still in existence under the name of "Cosme"), will always be remembered as the prominent figure of Australia's New Unionism. An ardent Socialist and deep student, his powerful pen led to the formulation and adoption of a political labor program, giving first place to the nationalization of the means of production and exchange. This, and the great industrial upheavals in the shape of strikes, brought the old parties, Liberal and Tory, to combine and form what is still known as the Coalition Government. The franchise, which already gave property plurality of votes, was amended so as to restrict the opportunities of the working classes to register as voters.

This and similar acts of aggression, gave rise to the formation of workers' political organizations in nearly all centers of population. Subsequently, at a joint convention of these bodies and the Federated Unions, the avowed Socialist plank was eliminated from the program, though as a whole it can be claimed as remaining Socialistic.

Political aims of the Labor Federation:

1. The nationalization of all sources of wealth and all means of producing and exchanging wealth.
2. The pensioning by the state of all child, aged and invalid citizens.
3. The just division among all the citizens of the state of all wealth production, less only that part requisite for public and common requirements.
4. The reorganization of society upon the above lines, to be commenced at once, and pursued uninterruptedly until social justice is fully secured to each and every citizen.

At the elections in 1893 the first real conflict at the ballot box between capital and labor ensued, although two by-elections

had previously been contested and won by the Labor party; 21,036 votes were recorded for labor and twelve Representatives returned to the Legislative Assembly, which consists of seventy-two members. The Capitalist party, including an independent remnant of the old Liberal party, polling 52,240 votes. The number of labor representatives increased at subsequent elections to eighteen in 1896 and twenty-one in 1899.

Owing to a temporary division in the Capitalist party in Parliament, the year 1900 saw the formation of the first purely labor administration. For five days only it was allowed to stand, when it had to give way to the reunited forces of capitalism.

At the first Federal elections last year, under manhood suffrage, labor won four out of six seats for the Senate (a former editor of the "Worker" heading the poll), and four out of eight seats for the Federal House of Representatives.

The State general elections held in March this year gave an increase to labor representation: 28,500 votes and twenty-four members for labor, as against 32,800 votes and forty-one members for the Capitalist party, was the result. The remaining seven seats falling to a nondescript independent party, with 6,500 votes. This result, obtained under a plural property franchise, is very gratifying, and indicative of the good progress of class-consciousness amongst the workers.

By the foregoing figures it can be seen that the position of parties here in Queensland is a unique one. In the other Australian States the Capitalist party is still divided into two factions, and the Labor party in those States, as well as in the Federal Legislatures, holds the balance of power. It has thereby been enabled to obtain some concessions, particularly in the matter of franchise (manhood and even adult suffrage has been secured in nearly all of them), industrial arbitration and shop and factories legislation.

It is but natural that here in Queensland a desire is making itself felt, to replace the capitalistic coalition, which cannot be compelled to make concessions, as soon as possible by a labor administration. As there is for this reason a danger of principles being sacrificed to expediency, it has become necessary for the Socialist section of the labor movement to form a special propaganda, going under the name of the Social Democratic Vanguard. Its object is by free and plentiful circulation of Socialist literature, by contributing columns to the labor press (consisting of about a dozen weekly journals, whose editors are mostly Socialists), and the sale of standard Socialist works, and by other means, to maintain and spread the spirit of class-consciousness.

With the present editor of "The Worker" an avowed and able Socialist, there exist all the elements of progress towards a united

Socialist party. There are no prominent party leaders, whose personal ambition is likely to prevent or hinder such a movement. Although there has been recently in New South Wales a division between the trades union and Socialist bodies, in all other States these are working in harmony. Already there are signs in Victoria of a pronouncedly Socialist labor movement, so the adoption by their labor council of the following Federal program goes to prove:

1. One adult, one vote.
2. Amendment of the Constitution providing for the initiative and national referendum.
3. Exclusion of undesirable races.
4. Old age pensions.
5. Uniform industrial legislation.
6. Gradual nationalization of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

Economic developments here in Australia have perhaps not reached the same acute stage as in America; industries primarily being connected with the production of raw material, and manufactures not concentrated and highly organized as in the land of trusts. But the absolute supremacy of capitalism can nevertheless be recognized on every hand. In private business, as in public finance, it holds dominant sway. The public indebtedness is increasing by leaps and bounds. T. A. Coghlan, the government statistician of New South Wales, in his book, "The Seven Colonies of Australasia" (1900-01), gives its indebtedness to the British financiers as £370,073,000, or £82 per head of population! The annual interest bill amounts to £14,513,000. Out of the foregoing sum of indebtedness £297,119,000 has accumulated within the last twenty-nine years. The money or money's worth, actually received by Australia was £8,669,000; the balance remained with or returned to the financiers as interest.

A severe industrial and financial crisis, such as was experienced here in 1893, is again setting in, and making itself felt throughout the continent.

Capitalism itself is thus, here as in every civilized portion of the earth, shaping the forces which are making for the overthrow of the present system and the adoption of the Socialist commonwealth.

E. H. KUNZE.

Jesus and Social Freedom.

RECENT discussions of the relation of Socialism to Religion, or to Christianity, have entirely omitted, so far as I have observed, an element which is vital. John Stuart Mill, in his essay on Liberty, offers the criticism on the Christian religion that it dwells too meagerly on questions of public duty and fails to sufficiently emphasize public virtue. An author writing recently on "Socialism versus Christianity," says: "Christianity deals with individuals and life hereafter, and teaches that life here is but a passing event preparatory to everlasting life. In the last analysis Christianity . . . deals only with the individual and a divine being." Professor Herron, the "Christian Socialist," maintains that "Jesus cannot solve the problem of economic and social freedom," claiming that he fails to lead man when man steps out beyond himself, or beyond his contemplation of his relationship to God, and faces the social or economic problem.

This criticism is a common one. And while Socialists advance the criticism with zeal the churches accept it with equal fervor. Organized historical Christianity prides itself on the unworldliness of Jesus. Lazarus on the doorstep and Dives at the table have been the figures to a suffering world of a condition which God mysteriously permits, not wishing to interfere in human affairs, but purposing to rectify the injustice in the other world. The pulpit still resounds with the doctrine: For the saint, resignation here, compensation hereafter; for the sinner, non-interference here, combustion hereafter. When defenders of the Christian religion, so-called, thus justify a criminal social condition in this world, by balancing it against endless punishment in some hypothetical future, it is not surprising that the enemies of this religion should maintain its insufficiency to face human problems, or that its independent critics should, like Mr. Mill, deplore its fatal limitation.

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that while Socialists are charging Christians with unworldliness, or "other-worldliness," and well nourished Christians in their sanctuaries are accepting the criticism with chastened joy, a rational interpretation of the words of Jesus himself on the subject would not be irrelevant.

It is not denied that Christian institutions and orthodox faiths and ordained messengers of "the gospel" have, with rare but notable exceptions, defended the restricted individualist conception of the Christian religion. The average church is wholly

wanting in the community ideal. The average sermon is barren of any suggestion which reaches beyond the personal element in life and duty. Civic life reflects the belief of the churches. Public officials are the concrete expression of the undeveloped or infirm will of the people. Conditions exist in nearly every community with the knowledge and without the protest of noble, generous, personally pure men, which they would die rather than permit to enter their own homes. Business methods are pursued by Christian men in their struggle to keep alive in the stifling competitive shuffle, which they dismiss as a horrid dream when they enter the quiet door of their own dwelling, or calmly walk to their reserved pew in "the House of God." The church, in the active business and manufacturing centers of our civilization, is a house of refuge for weary and troubled souls, where the savage hatred of desperate men may be forgotten in the sweet and heavenly love of Jesus. That the troubles of the vast majority of people in those communities are of such a nature, or have led to such conditions that they are a bar to entrance within the sacred walls, is a matter of pious regret and the kindly divine does not forget "the wayward and lost" in the Long Prayer, but a persistent and systematic effort to spread the benefits of the institution equally among the inhabitants of the city would be looked upon as too impracticable and "sociological" to be seriously advocated.

But is it not precisely such conditions as these against which Jesus sought to lead a social revolution? And is not his social philosophy as definitely and comprehensive as that of the most advanced Socialism to-day?

Examine one of his most familiar precepts, "Seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." The historic interpretation is something as follows: "Let a man become a Christian, casting all his care on God, seeking not riches nor ease, but only spiritual enrichment, and he shall have not only what he seeks, but he will also be the recipient of all the good things of earth. He need not ask, "What shall I eat or what shall I drink?" or be concerned with any other of the details of worldly care which perplex the Gentiles. God knows that he needs them and will supply them, if the man will but trust and believe. If this interpretation is correct we must surrender the case. Humanity must seek another savior. Jesus is proven false to the experiences of life. Thousands of people, personally virtuous, patient, industrious, believers in the good old Bible, faithful to church from childhood, kind to their neighbors and absolutely upright, have spent their latter days or years with neither food enough to eat, nor pure water to drink, nor clothing to hide their diseased and weakened bodies.

Twenty per cent of London's mature population die in the almshouse. The pauper plots of the graveyards of Christendom are packed with the crumbling bones of the saints.

If this individualist interpretation is correct, Jesus was an unpractical dreamer who knew nothing of the legitimate demands of honest life. But he said nothing of the kind. He did not say that if a man would first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness all these things would be added to him. He was speaking to the people of a community, a type community; not to an isolated individual. He said, "Seek ye." The message is to Man, not to a man. He would seem to say, If you people will get together, if you will unitedly seek God's kingdom and his right doing, you will find that not one of the necessities of life is wanting. There is food enough in the world, and clothing enough for all. No one need go hungry or naked. No child need be homeless, no aged man or woman need beg bread. Let natural laws—which are divine laws—become the sole bond in social relations and all these things shall be added. Material necessities are not to be regarded as outside the religious idea, nor pursued as secular interests. They are essentially religious; they are vital. "The Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things."

Again he said, "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on." And his professed followers have added, The man who is anxious about material things is a rebel against God. A widow with four hungry children, a sick baby and seven dollars rent for her tenement, worries about feeding and clothing them, because she can get but a dollar a day when there is work and nothing when there is no work. She needs conversion! People look anxious and worn. Engage a revivalist and get them born again! Under existing economic conditions ninety per cent of the people are absolutely prohibited from obeying this command so interpreted. The bare necessities of physical life are a constant source of anxiety. Children are taught in infancy that, as soon as their arms are strong enough, they must earn bread. The crowning ideal of multitudes of young men in college or business is to "make a living." The enthusiasm of art, the buoyant joy of creation, are precluded. The factory groans with overwork and the sweatshop reeks with nauseating odors. Many a patient mother bends over the pile of unfinished garments, working by dim light far into the night, knowing that this perpetual sin against herself is the only possible answer to the cry of hunger from her children. Poverty has desecrated her body—the temple of the living God—transforming it into a human machine with

but one goal for its effort—bread. Verily the morrow hath evils enough of its own and to spare.

But if humanity would live by laws natural to its life, as the birds and flowers live by laws natural to their life, this evil would cease. As there is soil enough for every blade of grass, sunshine and dew enough to drink, so that no blade need to persecute and crush its neighbor; as there is vitality enough in nature to nourish all the flowers, bringing each to its perfection in fragrance, form and color, without robbing any other flower of a chance to live; as the birds find their food and nesting boughs and distant summer climes to welcome them, and their sweetest songs are contributions to, not subtractions from, the universal harmony; so for man there is land enough to cultivate, water enough to drink, food enough to eat; there is clay enough to model, cotton and wool enough to weave, brass and iron enough to fashion, wood enough to carve; there are songs to be created, pictures to be painted, designs to be imagined and realized, epics to be written, glories of nature and art to be discovered and proclaimed; there is work enough to satisfy the divine creative faculty of humanity, and rest enough to restore all its vigor and quicken all its zeal. Reasonable labor; reasonable rest.

Nor is the analogy vitiated by the fact that, in nature, side by side with these pictures of beauty and peace, are also enacted the most violent and cruel tragedies in the processes of Natural Selection for the survival of the fittest. The crowning contribution of modern science to the problems of social evolution is in the exposition of the fact that, as John Fiske has shown, "the wholesale destruction of life which has heretofore characterized evolution ever since life began and through which the higher forms of organic existence have been produced, must presently come to an end in the case of the chief of God's creatures." The struggle had been for physical existence; in man it become the struggle for the perfection of the psychical. The very mental equipments which have made savage man more cunning and destructive than all the beasts of the field are the endowments by which, in the experiences of social development, the need for cunning and destruction will be outgrown.

The action of natural selection is reduced to the minimum through the operation of social conditions, by the co-operation of individuals to produce and appropriate the essentials for life. In the evolutionary development it remained for man to discover that supplies are not in limited, but in unlimited, quantities to be brought into requisition by skill. Physical prowess and individual struggle against others thus give place to mental application and co-operation. And be it observed, these social conditions, this human genius for adaptation and appropriation, this tendency to

replace brute warfare in the seizure of whatever natural sustenance already exists, by the effort to co-operate for the creation of larger and better supplies—are as truly manifestations of the working of natural law as were the former purely physical modes. Therefore the analogy suggested by Jesus, thus interpreted, is distinctly in the line of the most modern scientific demonstration and the problem of existence for the human race becomes the problem, not of the survival of the few, but of the utmost development of all. In the day when man discovered that, by assisting nature, he could regulate supplies of food and raiment, in that day the dominion of competitive strife was doomed. It remained for Jesus to announce that, if men would live by the highest formula discovered for human life as the birds live by the highest formula for bird life, all things needed for the body could be secured for all. The wealth of nature, developed by the skill and industry of man, is sufficient for all humanity. Not art for a rare genius or two in every age. Not food and clothing to make glorious the daughter of a stockyard king, while the daughter of the peasant who wove the garment is pinched with hunger and cold. Not clear springs for this mansion and that, while the huts of the laborers are supplied through rusty water pipes, by a selfish corporation, from a tainted pond.

Only by becoming a brotherhood can humanity cease its anxiety for food and raiment. Only when men learn that life is of more value than a corner in wheat, and that the body of the sweatshop slave is more precious than the delicate fabrics which enrich the commerce of a city or nation; only when men learn to place a higher value upon the divine image in the life of the pale, half-starved child of the tenement than upon the protected privileges of his economic tyrant; only when men are willing to abolish the unnatural and arbitrary laws by which society now impresses the multitude into service in the interest of the few and enslaves the freeborn by permitting another to own his opportunity to live—only then, by the recognition of natural laws, shall society be able to come into its kingdom and man become free.

Then shall the words of Jesus, "Man shall not live by bread alone," become the emancipation proclamation to the two divisions of society spending life in the eager struggle for material things—the one to revel in abundance, the other to secure bare necessities. The former are recalled from their futile reliance on the sufficiency of the material, the latter are assured that this much at least is a fundamental and universal right. He did not say that bread is not needed, but that bread is not enough. A sufficiency of material food is not the goal of human effort, but is the point of departure for those higher demands of our nature which are the expressions of the real life. If bread is not enough for sustenance, assuredly

the less than bread—sometimes doled, often refused to many of its members by our present industrial society—becomes a grewsome emphasis upon the Wilderness Temptation. Is this not the germ principle of the Socialist revolution? It is undoubtedly the plain teaching of the Nazarene.

He recognized and clearly taught the necessity for a sound material basis in all social and ethical development. His conception of society as an organic unit, his condemnation of individual hoarding of goods, his rebuke of luxury in the presence of want, and his constant application of the principle of brotherhood in human relations clearly indicate that he believed society had reached that stage in its economic evolution at which the social order should change from the narrow and warring individualism of primitive times to the broader and more productive methods of co-operation. However warmly defenders of "the faith" may have claimed everything in sight as the fruit of a revealed system of truth, it is evident that Jesus himself did not ignore, nor relegate to a secondary place, the problem of bread. Indeed, any interpretation of his words which gives them meaning today will show that he proceeds upon the principle, which Frederick Engels calls "The materialistic conception of history," that production and exchange of material things is the ground work of every social order; while the thesis of the "Communist Manifesto" of the early Socialistic fathers reads like a modern adaptation of the life philosophy of the Man of Galilee. It is not maintained that the full significance of this philosophy could be at once understood. The evolution of industrial methods was essential to the development and application of the truth. It is only held that no social or economic principle has been evolved by the most advanced teacher of social freedom which either contradicts or supersedes that philosophy.

It is only by interpreting these words of Jesus as fundamental principles in the program of economic and social freedom that they can be made to have any meaning whatever to this age. Nor could they have been otherwise received with any definite meaning, even in the days of economic simplicity in which they were uttered. It is true that his words upon public duties were few. But those that were spoken were tremendously significant. That the immediate disciples of Jesus understood his teaching to involve an economic revolution is proven by the fact that their first impulse was toward the formation of a collectivist society. If they failed in this it was not because of the inherent falsehood of any member, but for the same reason that similar colonies have failed since that day—because they were necessarily in contact with a capitalistic system in which cunning and falsehood have a commercial value. But their failure reflects in no way upon the wisdom of the teach-

ing they sought to apply. He announced ethical principles adapted to the age which is certainly coming, when strife and the modes of conduct consistent with strife shall be entirely swept away by the intelligent co-operation of a race conscious of its organic unity, and the full significance and appropriateness of his message can only appear when that day comes.

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.

New York.

EDITORIAL

Already the census of 1900 is yielding a rich harvest for the Socialists. It is one more proof of the way in which the logic of events is continually arguing against the continuance of capitalism. No one could perform a much greater service for the Socialist movement of this country than by putting a few weeks', or months' work upon this census and analyzing from it the facts which would be of value to Socialist workers.

Time and space prevent us from giving more than a few of the most obvious facts. Perhaps the first thing which strikes any one who gives even a cursory examination to the bulletins on manufacture is the strong confirmation afforded to the Socialist doctrine of concentration of industry. There is scant comfort here for the Bernsteinian or anarchist. There is scarcely an industry which does not show the most rapid elimination of the middle class, a continual increase in the capitalization by plant, and in every way an enlargement of the unit of industry. Another thing which is brought prominently to the front is the continuous decrease in the relative share of the total product received by the laborer. Although the census statistics are not arranged in such a manner as to show this to the best advantage (and it is not hard to guess the reason why), yet the facts are so evident as to defy concealment by the jugglers of figures. In many cases the decrease of wages has been absolute and in many others there has been an extensive substitution of child for adult labor.

There have also been great territorial changes in industry affecting the populations of whole districts; there is a shifting of the centers of production toward the South and toward the West. As was of course to be expected, this census shows a continuous and rapid growth of the percentage of urban to the total population. This percentage has increased from 29.2 in 1890 to 33.1 per cent in 1900. In some portions of the country more than a majority of the population are living in the cities. This is true of the North Atlantic division, where 58.6 per cent are put down as city residents. In the South Central division, however, only 11 per cent and in the Western division 31 per cent are found in the centers of population.

Taking the woollen industry we find that the number of establishments have been as follows:

1880	2,689
1890	2,489
1900	2,335

Meantime capital has increased steadily from \$159,000,000 in 1880 to \$392,000,000 in 1900.

The above total includes hosiery and knit goods, and not only the plants actually engaged in producing for the market but those in educational, eleemosynary and penal institutions. Considering only the normal industry we have the following:

Number of establishments—

1870	3,208
1880	2,330
1890	1,693
1900	1,414

In the meantime capital has increased steadily from \$121,450,000 in 1870 to over \$310,000,000 in 1900.

During the last decade salaries have increased.....	59 per cent
No of wage earners.....	3 per cent
Total wages	6 per cent
Number of men employed	6 per cent
Children employed have increased.....	7 per cent
Value of products	9 per cent

In the cotton industry the movement has been even more striking. This industry came to this country already fully developed, and is today one of the foremost in the United States. The following table, giving the number of establishments since 1840, is a powerful picture of the growth of concentration:

1840	1,240
1850	1,094
1860	1,091
1870	956
1880	756
1890	905
1900	973

Capital meanwhile has increased from \$51,000,000 in 1840 to \$460,000,000 in 1900.

The trifling increase in the number of factories during the last decade is accounted for entirely from the movement in the Southern States. In these States the process of concentration has not had time to run its whole course and, hence, a momentary though insignificant increase in the number of establishments is seen. This industry also furnishes some interesting facts concerning the condition of the wage-workers.

During the last decade the number of men employed has increased 51 per cent; women 16 per cent; children under 16 years of age 72 per cent. But the total sum paid in wages to these children has only increased 29 per cent. The number of spindles has increased from 2,000,000 in 1840 to 19,000,000 in 1900. Number of looms has increased from 126,000 in 1860 (the first year in which this item is given) to 450,000 in 1900. During the last year the cotton consumed increased 62 per cent.

The number of children under 16 years of age in the Southern States has increased as follows:

1880	4,097
1890	8,815
1900	24,438

The Census Bulletin treating of this points to the fact that the Northrup loom has more than doubled the capacity of the weaver since 1895. The readers will notice that wages did not take any proportional increase.

Bulletin No. 204 gives us a view of the combined textile industries of the United States. As this is perhaps the most comprehensive Bulletin that has been issued, the figures which it gives are doubly interesting. The following table of establishments shows the process of concentration when taken in connection with the fact that since 1840 capital has increased in round numbers from \$112,500,000 to \$1,042,997,000 in 1900. In other words, while the number of plants has increased about 30 per cent, capitalization has increased 1,000 per cent.

The number of establishments has been as follows:

1850	3,025
1860	3,027
1870	4,790
1880	4,018
1890	4,276
1900	4,312

This includes cotton, wool, silk, hosiery, and knit goods.

In this comprehensive survey of the textile industries we find that while the number of salaried officials has increased 59 per cent and salaries 87 per cent, the number of wage earners has only increased 27 per cent, and total sum paid in wages only 23 per cent. One of the reasons why wages have thus fallen far behind the rate of increase of number of wage workers is seen by the fact that the number of children under 16 years of age has increased 62 per cent.

In the last half century the number of wage earners employed in this set of industries has increased 336 per cent, while the value of their products has increased 586 per cent.

Taking the manufacture of clothing we have the following facts to be noted:

Number of establishments—

1870	7,858
1880	6,166
1890	4,867
1900	5,731

Capital has increased from \$50,000,000 in 1870 to \$120,000,000 in 1900, but has decreased during the last decade 6 per cent. The total number of wage earners decreased 16 per cent since 1890; total wages 10 per cent; number of men employed decreased 29 per cent, while the number of children under 16 years increased 98 per cent. This indicates the growth of sweat shop production as is further proven by the fact that of the 864 new shops which were established from 1890 to 1900, 700 were in Illinois. In this State the number of shops increased from 199 in 1890 to 900 in 1900. This apparent growth of small industries, however, was accompanied by an absolute decrease in the number of wage earners from 16,000 to 14,000, the total wages also falling from \$5,892,000 to \$5,845,000. At the same time, however, that wages were thus absolutely decreasing and the number of employes

growing fewer, the value of the products increased from \$33,600,000 to \$37,300,000. Here, again, we find the reason for this in the great increase of child labor. In the State of Illinois, the number of men employed decreased from 12,000 to 5,000; the number of women increased from 3,618 to 9,105, and the number of children from 74 to 778. Thus the apparent prosperity of the small industries is seen to be accompanied by lower wages, increase of child labor, and general degradation of the employe.

Another industry in which concentration has reached a very high point is that of slaughtering and meat packing. In this the number of establishments decreased in the last ten years from 1,118 to 921. At the same time the capital invested grew from \$116,887,000 to \$189,198,000. Since the census was out, as every one knows, this process of concentration has proceeded much further, until to-day the point of complete monopoly is well nigh at hand.

Turning to salary and wage account, we find the same old story. The payment of the managing force, called salaries, has increased 123 per cent, while the number of wage earners has grown 55 per cent, and total sum paid for wages comes slowly on behind with only 37 per cent increase. The number of women employed has increased 197 per cent and that of children 138 per cent. The reports of the census also show an important geographical movement in this industry. In 1860 the center of the packing industry was Cincinnati and the Ohio Valley; it has followed the corn belt West until it is now located in Illinois, but is rapidly moving to Kansas and Nebraska.

Census report No. 199 on Flouring and Grist Mill products furnishes a study of that industry in words which might well be copied into a Socialist handbook. It says:

"The most rapid increase in the number of establishments was in the decennial period from 1860 to 1870. From 1880 to 1890 there was a very marked decrease. This decrease was due, not to any diminution in the importance of the industry, as will be seen by referring to the amount of capital invested, but rather to the tendency to combine in a single establishment many of the smaller mills. The milling industry, like every other, illustrates the well-established fact that greater economy in manufacture can be secured in a small number of large mills than in a large number of small mills. Thus, while there was a decrease of 5,868 in the number of mills from 1880 to 1890, there was a large increase in the capital invested and a small increase in the value of products. It is true there was a decided fall in the prices of materials from 1880 to 1890, so that the actual cost of the materials, even if used in increased quantities, in 1890 was somewhat less than in 1880, but by improvement in the milling processes and the utilization of by-products, the actual value of products was considerably increased. . . . The number of wage earners in 1900 diminished owing principally to improved processes in handling grain and products which lessened the amount of manual labor required."

During twenty years the number of establishments has remained practically stationary, while capital has increased, in round numbers, from \$177,000,000 to \$219,000,000. But while the total product has increased steadily from \$444,000,000 in 1870 to \$580,000,000 in 1900, the

number of men employed has decreased from 57,795 in 1870 to 36,419 in 1900.

The manufacture of agricultural implements presents an almost typical development, as will be shown by the following table of the number of establishments since 1850:

1850	1,333
1860	2,116
1870	2,076
1880	1,943
1890	910
1900	715

The student will notice the rapid increase in the number of plants in the first ten years, when the industry was gaining a foothold and then a steady decrease in the number of plants until the present time. While, at the same time the amount of capital employed, which was \$3,500,000 in 1850, has grown over fifty-fold, now amounting to over \$157,700,000. One might think that this was a theoretical illustration of the evolution of industry prepared in some study rather than a census bulletin of facts which speak better than words of the marvelous farsightedness of those early Socialist analyzers of capitalism.

The printing and publishing industry repeats the same story. The number of establishments has increased only 34 per cent, while capital has added 49 per cent to its value. In the decade from 1890 the regular contrast between salary and wages is seen, the former increasing 37 per cent, the latter but 6 per cent, although the value of product of these laborers has grown 26 per cent.

When the host of small printing establishments is eliminated from consideration and newspapers and periodicals alone are studied, the figures become even more striking, and this in spite of the thousands and thousands of little country newspapers which are practically dependent on the patent inside and plate matter concerns.

In newspapers and periodicals the number of establishments has increased only 23 per cent, while capital has grown nearly twice as fast, showing an increase of 52 per cent; salaries have followed capital with an equal increase, but the number of wage earners has only grown 10 per cent and total wages have actually fallen off 1 per cent. The number of men employed has, as usual, grown much slower than the number of women and children, and men's wages show a decrease amounting to 4 per cent. Meantime the total product has increased 24 per cent. The same story is told in another way when we note that the aggregate number of copies issued during the census year reached 8,168,148,749, an increase of 74 per cent since 1890, and of 125 per cent since 1880. In the meantime the number of publications has only increased 22.47 per cent during these periods.

In alcoholic liquors we find the same phenomena repeated. Taking malt liquors first we get the following statistics:

Number of establishments—

1870	1,972
1880	2,191
1890	1,248
1900	1,509

Meantime capital has increased from \$48,000,000 in 1870 to \$415,000,000 in 1900, the increase being fairly regular.

During the last decade capital has increased.....78 per cent
Salaries increased70 per cent
Total wage earners increased!30 per cent
Total wages increased24 per cent

Distilled liquors, owing to changes in the revenue laws, show some abnormal characteristics. Nevertheless, in spite of this disturbing factor, the same evolution can be traced. The following, comment and all, is taken verbatim from the census bulletin:

Number of establishments—

1850	968
1860	1,215
1870	719
(Effect of war revenue tax.)	
1880	844
1890	440
1900	967

There has been a steady increase in capital from \$5,000,000 in 1850 to \$32,000,000 in 1900.

During the last decade capital has increased! 5 per cent
Salaries increased56 per cent
Total wage earners decreased21 per cent
Total wages decreased22 per cent
Value of products decreased 7 per cent

"It seems that the census of 1890 concerned itself only with the largest and most important establishments and considered each combination of distilleries operated by the same corporation as one establishment. It appears that the very small fruit and grain distilleries distributed in great number through the Southern States, and especially Virginia and North Carolina, were much more thoroughly canvassed in 1900 than in 1890. These facts explain the disproportionate increase during the last decade."

In the petroleum industry a few more plants have gone to the wall, the total number being now but 67 instead of 94, as in 1890. Every one, of course, knows that all save two or three of these, and, indeed, all but the Standard Oil Company, are so insignificant as to be scarcely worthy of consideration. But, while the number of establishments has decreased, capital has continued to grow from \$77,000,000 to \$95,000,000. But this increase of 23 per cent in capital was accompanied by 7 per cent of increase in number of wage earners, and although wages show a much better proportionate increase in this than in any other industry, being 14 per cent, yet still they fall far behind the increase of 45 per cent in the value of product.

Taking some things that are considered as minor industries we find the same evolution. In pianos, the establishments increased 11 per cent, capital 110 per cent. In needles and pins the number of establishments decreased from 45 to 43; capital grew from \$1,800,000 to \$3,200,000. The manufacture of clay products shows that the number of establishments has remained practically stationary for twenty years,

being 6,383 in 1880, 6,423 in 1900. But capital has grown from \$35,000,000 in 1880 to \$148,000,000 in 1900. But, while capital in the last decade has increased 32 per cent wages have gone up but 2 per cent. The number of men employed has actually decreased 15 per cent, and the number of women has increased 103 per cent.

Taking glass manufacture, we find an increase of 20 per cent in the number of establishments and an increase of 49 per cent in capital. Salaries have been raised 126 per cent. And during this time of prosperity the census tells us that sixty glass factories, with a capital of a half million, were idle.

The industries here mentioned cover practically all the great productive forces of the United States. The only important fields excluded are those of the steel industries, transportation, storage and communication. It so happens, however, that these are just the ones in which the movements we are tracing have been so evident as to admit of no denial. Hence, it is safe to say that everything predicated of those described is certain to be found in a more pronounced form in the others.

The only other field of any importance is that of agriculture. We shall hope in our next number to give an analysis of the census figures on this subject to show that here, as elsewhere, the process of proletarianization and exploitation is going on.

The October number of the Review will contain not so much a reply to the article of Comrade Kautsky as an expansion and explanation of some of the points criticised by him in "The American Farmer," together with an elaboration of some recent developments in agriculture.

Correction.

Comrade Jean Longuet calls our attention to the following correction in his article on the "Socialist Party of France," which appeared in the July number of The Review. On page 18 the Socialist vote in the Department of the Iser in 1898 should be 12,861, instead of 72,861, and the vote this year should be 22,000 instead of 27,861.

On page 22, the total vote of the Socialist party in 1898 should be given as 730,000, instead of 790,000.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

France.

The Socialists are interested spectators of the cruise of the radicals under the leadership of Premier Combes against the congregations. The plous fraters, paters and sisters, whose organizations so vallantly upheld "law and order" against the "pernicious" demand of the Belgian Socialist for universal suffrage, are now getting a dose of this same law and order. They show their respect for the law by disregarding the orders of the government, and "inciting the masses" to do the same. The law is now being enforced by the help of soldiers and gendarmes, who surround the schools and cloisters that are to be closed and, in the presence of an excited multitude, invite the priests and nuns to evacuate. If this polite invitation does not induce the occupants to "voluntarily" comply with the law, they are bundled out without further parley. On one occasion, the soldiers marched into a town with bayonets fixed and lined up for action, when one of the leaders of the Catholics, a Count Somebody, appeared on the scene, declared that they did not wish to fight against the army, requested the commander of the troops to sheath the bayonets, which was done, and "prevailed" on the nuns to accompany him into a neighboring church, whereupon the establishment was sealed by the sheriff. In the Bretagne, certain factory owners closed down and invited their employes, on penalty of dismissal, to take part in the demonstrations against the government. Others forced their employes to take their children out of the secular schools by threatening them with discharge. In Paris, a demonstration of the clericals was prevented by the Socialists who filled the square from which the procession was to start long before the clericals had assembled.

That is a true picture of capitalism. Brutal and oppressive in everything it does, it tries to accomplish even the work of intellectual emancipation and human freedom by the methods of a tyrant. It is unfit for any elevating work, because it creates classes with divergent interests that cannot be reconciled within the limits of the present system and must, therefore, be harmonized by the state that enforces laws in the interest of one class regardless of the wishes of the others.

How little radical the radicals are is shown by the report that the bosses are taking advantage of the cabinet change to cripple the Mille-rand law which provides for a 10½-hour day in all establishments where young men and women below 18 years of age are working

together with adults. A large number of workingmen have signed the petition of the bosses, either from ignorance or fear of discharge. The trade unions seek to head this movement off by demanding an extension of the law to all industries. They might easily obtain this and more, if they would turn their energies in the right direction. But the Socialists have been defeated in the elections at Marseilles and Lille—by the help of workingmen's votes who prefer to beg from masters what they should accomplish as free men. Comrade Lafargne, at a recent mass meeting of the Parti Ouvrier Français, consoled himself and his audience with the reflection that the Socialist party must not necessarily win through the increase of mandates won at the ballot box. "Our task," he said, "consists in preparing the proletariat for the revolution. The revolution of 1789 took place without a previous campaign, thanks to an energetic agitation and enlightenment."

Germany.

The Socialist party is continuing to reap the fruits of the agrarian tariff policy by numerous electoral victories. The most significant and unexpected of these were the victories in Alsace. In Strasburg, the old Socialist seat, was retained in the first ballot and twelve new seats won in the second ballot, so that the municipal council is now composed of thirteen Socialists, fourteen Liberals, four Democrats, four Clericals and one independent. In Mulhausen, the second ballot resulted in the election of thirteen Socialists, thirteen Democrats, thirteen independents, the majority of the Socialists and Democrats over the Liberal-Clerical parties being 2,600. Two Socialists were elected in Gebweiler. Schiltigheim and Dettweiler each elected its first Socialists. These victories, coming right after the abolition of the dictatorial laws that prevented a free expression of public opinion, cause so much more consternation in the capitalist camp, as Minister von Koeller had declared in the Reichstag only a few days before the election that Socialism was practically dead in Alsace-Lorraine and would never rise again.

Comrade Groth of the "Mecklenburger Zeitung" is the first Socialist elected in the municipal council of Rostock, Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg. In Lichtenberg, a suburb of Berlin, the Socialists elected their full ticket and announced the fact in the following words: Out of 300 votes, the Socialists received 300, and the capitalists 00. In Bayreuth, Bavaria, the Socialist vote has increased by 2,089 votes since the last election for the Diet.

These results, together with the fact that the Socialists are now taking part in the Landtag elections, and that the national convention of the Socialist party, to be held in Munich, Bavaria, on Sept. 14 and following days, will form the basis for the coming Reichstag's elections, disturb the serenity of the "possessing" classes considerably. On the program of this convention we find, among others, the following reports: On parliamentary activity by E. Rosenow; on coming Reichstag's election by A. Bebel; on workingmen's insurance by H. Molkenbuhr; on municipal activity by Dr. Lindemann.

The Socialists are making good progress among the trade unions, as shown by the recent trade union congress. A new family paper, "Die Huette" (The Hut), published by H. Wallfisch, Dresden, on the first and fifteenth of each month, and designed especially for proletarian children, is finding a hearty support.

How labor legislation, passed after long and hard struggles through the initiative of the Socialists, is enforced by the capitalist government is shown by a recent official report. An inspection of 1,876 establishments revealed the fact that 1,749, or 93 per cent, of them did not observe the laws regulating the protection to employes, so that 4,755 accidents could be traced directly to the violation of the laws. Only twenty-three of these violators were fined a total of 165 mark (about \$39.), or about 8 mark (\$1.90) each. And yet some people declare that such useless patchwork is the main purpose of the Socialist party. Such work agrees better with the "radical" parties that insert themselves as a pad between the Socialists and capitalists, and is better left to them. They are helping us also in many other ways.

A director of a German trade school recently declared that "the practical education must be increased in school. Not only drawing and technical theories, but also practical exercise in school workshops is required. Apart from the practical value of the detailed explanation of the 'how' and 'why' of its special task, the child also profits in health by the change from the recitation room to the workshop."

We highly appreciate the great pains which the bourgeoisie take in educating the children of the working class for the economic duties of the co-operative commonwealth, and we cheerfully devote ourselves to our special duty, the political education of the producing class.

Russia.

The social pot is boiling in Russia and the autocratic "little father" is getting ready to swallow the soup which he and his bureaucrats have been preparing. It is said that he is studying the social question. What business has he in a responsible position, if he has not studied it before? To judge from all reports, he has not yet learned as much as his Socialist subjects in Finland, who have just appointed a regular delegate for the International Bureau in Brussels. He is sending the most arrogant of his henchmen to the seat of the disturbances to "investigate" with knout and saber. He has forbidden the continuation of the excellent semstvo statistics, that were a constant reproach to him and his administration, in the governments of Bessarabia, Jekaterinoslav, Kadan, Kursk, Orel, Pensa, Poltava, Samara, Simbirsk, Tula, Charkov, and Tschernigov, and "left it to the discretion" of the governors of twenty-two others to do the same. It is reported that he intends to receive 200 persons of all classes in audience "for the sake of reform." But the Vorwaerts publishes a secret circular letter of the governor of the government Saratov, in which he calls the attention of his police prefects to the revolutionary movement among the peasants and instructs them "to take the most radical measures for its suppression." The document outlines the tactics observed by

the "bad men who influence the peasants against the government" and speaks well for the progress of the revolutionary movement.

In the meantime some of the "good men" of the administration suspended a meeting of sixty Jewish working women in Liebau and arrested them. The women were forcibly submitted to a medical examination and received "yellow tickets," that is, licenses for prostitutes. A little "reform" with a good stout stick wouldn't hurt those officials.

Peter Struwe edits a new review, "Osvoboschdeniye" (Emancipation), which is printed by Dietz in Stuttgart, Germany. The aim of the publication is to gather material for the critique of Russian absolutism and carry the idea of the political emancipation of Russia into all classes.

Austria-Hungary.

The farm laborers in Galizia have been on strike for some time. This is the first united attempt of the Gallician rural proletariat to better its condition and is due to the energetic agitation of the Socialists. In spite of the provocations of the nobles and their servile gendarmes and bureau officials, the laborers stood their ground quietly and carried their demands in most communes. In a few places, where troops were solicited without reason by the proprietors and committed excesses against women and children, riots occurred and the strike failed in consequence. In others, the officials suppressed the Socialist papers and distributed circulars warning the laborers against the "unscrupulous agitators who wish to deceive them." The old game of crying "stop thief" to escape detection falls to work, however. You can't fool all the Galicians all the time.

Nor all the Hungarians, either. In Mako, the county seat of the Osanader Comitatus, fourteen Socialists were elected to the municipal council, giving them one-third of the whole body.

Luxemburg.

In the canton of Esch, the Socialists elected five of their six candidates for parliament, in spite of the handicap of a poll tax of 10 francs. There are forty-eight representatives in the chamber, and although the Socialists make up only one-eighth of it, their presence will be felt.

Italy.

The Socialists in Turin increased their votes by 1,500 in three years and elected nine new councillors in addition to the fifteen that are already in that body. In Geneva five Socialists entered the municipal council, in Florence ten, in Bologna five in town and ten in the prov-

ince, while in Naples the Camorra is again triumphant. The total of newly elected councillors amounts to about sixty in 200 communes, which, added to the 1,268 councillors in 372 communes elected in previous elections, make a good showing for our Italian comrades. A new paper, "Agitazione Proletaria," edited by the Socialist women of Milan, increases their forces still more.

South Africa.

News comes from the "Rand" that the English and German workmen in Johannesburg formed a political organization with the following program: Manhood suffrage for white men 18 years of age; taxation of the land so that the unearned increment will go to the people; equal election districts; uniform election day, to be regarded as a legal holiday, saloons and restaurants to be closed during elections; secret ballot; salaries for representatives; election of Upper House by direct vote of the people; eight-hour day in state and municipal enterprises; protective labor laws; prohibition of sweating; nationalization of railroads and telegraphs; municipalization of street railways, waterworks, and lighting plants; prohibition of Chinese immigration; compulsory arbitration; minimal wage for white and colored laborers; land reform after New Zealand's pattern; progressive income tax; federation of South Africa, to be demanded by popular referendum.

After a little trimming by a few years of experience this program will bring the English capitalists face to face with a foe who will prove more formidable than the Boers.

Brazil.

Somewhat late we learn that the second national convention of the Partido Socialista Brasileiro met in Sao Paulo from May 29 to 31. A program was adopted, which had to be published in Portuguese, Italian, Spanish, German and French, on account of the cosmopolitan character of the assembly. Owing to the economic backwardness of the country, the program shows a rather mixed jumble of contradictory conceptions and demands, but it emphasizes the socialization of the means of production and exchange as the final aim. The "immediate demand" tall has no less than thirty-three distinct joints and comprises about everything that was ever demanded by freethinkers, direct legislation leagues, trade unions, prohibitionists and female suffragists. There is no danger that the party will run ahead of public opinion with such an appendix for the opportunists to pull back on.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The colossal \$120,000,000 harvester trust, which was incorporated in New Jersey last week, is starting out after big profits in true capitalistic style. When the promoters gently broke the news of what was transpiring to the dear public a few weeks ago it was stated that the main object of forming the trust was to ensure "stability of prices." This made "the public" glad, for it does not like to take chances in competitive chaos, despite the fact that anarchists preach that competition is the finest system that could ever be devised. The workingman doubtless was also pleased, for stable prices mean that wages will not be in the same danger of being cut as when there is fluctuation. But the farmer became nervous, and when it was hinted later that a slight advance would be made on "some" agricultural implements that had been sold "below cost" the tiller of the soil began to scratch his head and pull his whiskers. A slight raise on this and that tool means money out of his pocket and more difficulty in meeting the interest on his mortgage or paying his taxes or his rent. The next chapter is a Chicago dispatch, dated Aug. 16, which reads as follows: "The International Harvester Co., following its public declaration that economy in the manufacture and distribution of agricultural machinery was the motive for the \$120,000,000 merger, has made a move in that direction. Several of the Chicago companies that make up the combine have issued letters to their general agents throughout the country, ordering a reduction of about three-fourths of the total number of employes representing these companies in the field. The other companies in the combine are preparing to do the same. Equally radical reductions in the official forces are being planned for the near future. Ten thousand men in all are expected to lose their positions." Thus we have two interesting facts: First, the users of agricultural implements will pay more than heretofore; second, ten thousand traveling salesmen, office workers, mechanics and laborers will be laid off indefinitely to curtail production and stiffen prices. This is not a theory; it is a condition. How do those who vote to uphold the capitalist system and trust like the jolt they have received?

J. Pierpont Morgan, king of industry, has returned from Europe, where he has been for some months hobnobbing with some of the petty rulers of the old country—such as King Edward, Emperor William and still lesser lights, and incidentally organizing his shipping trust, gobbling up iron mines in the Netherlands, valuable franchises in London, aiding the tobacco and beef trust magnates to launch their combines, and arranging with the Rothschilds to establish an international bank

with branches in the Eastern countries, South America and other lands. Mr. Morgan's lieutenants declare he will now put the finishing touches to his Northwestern railway merger, his Southern railway merger, his ship combine and bring order out of chaos in the coal industry, and perform a few other herculean labors that will tend to put a quietus to the competitive system. Mr. Morgan himself says in an interview that America is only entering the combination era, and that trusts as large and perhaps larger than the United States Steel Corporation (capitalized at \$1,400,000,000) will be formed. This statement on the part of the great financier is causing the hair of the reactionists to stand on ends, and old Russell Sage, for instance, declares in saddened tones that "the people" will not allow trustification to go on, but will revolt—revolt, mind you—but he does not say when or where or how, whether at the ballot-box or with guns and bombs and indiscriminate slaughter. Some of the daily papers are firing similar thoughtlets in double-leaded editorials at the people, but, as usual, they are densely silent upon the question as to how the triumphal march of the modern conqueror can be stopped. Again we rise to remark that the Socialist party has a plan and that the others have none.

As the time approaches for the next annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, at New Orleans about two months hence, the various national unions are becoming more clamorous in their demands for jurisdiction over fractions of workers in different trades. The original "autonomy" fight between the brewers on the one hand and the engineers, firemen, teamsters, etc., on the other will probably serve to draw the lines between those who favor organizing the workers as distinct industries and those who desire to retain the old forms of craft distinction. This question is a vital one—indeed, it overshadows all else on the industrial field at the present time. The progressive element in the A. F. of L. holds that, to meet the combined employers of to-day with any degree of success in securing shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions, it is absolutely necessary to have all workers in a given trade in one union, so that there will be no clashing between two or more sets of officers in times of trouble and thus weaken any move that may be made. The conservatives would attach the workers to the unions of their crafts wherever found, contending that they have distinct craft interests that are disregarded by the majority in an industry. Thus, the brewery workers aim to combine the brewers, coopers, laborers, drivers, engineers, firemen and other workers as one body, and they deny the charge that they have been negligent in the matter of securing better conditions for engineers, firemen and other branches in the brewing industry. The first important "autonomy" struggle occurred between the printers and machinists at the Detroit convention, in 1899. The typographical union claimed jurisdiction over composing rooms in the printing industry, and with the advent of machinery the machinist came. The machinists' union insisted that a machinist is not a printer, and therefore should belong to the former organization. The Detroit convention "straddled" the issue, with a slight leaning toward the machinists, but the printers held fast to their new brothers, and at the Louisville convention the following year they practically gained their point. At this convention the brew-

ers' trouble was "straddled," as well as the grievances of minor unions, and the same thing happened at Scranton last year. Meanwhile, the postponement of the issuing of a plain, straightforward declaration, so that a readjustment could be made, has caused and is causing endless trouble. The brewers' union is rent asunder in Cincinnati, where the engineers and firemen sided with a bosses' combine in a strike, and the same condition exists in several other places. The printers are in for trouble again, the pressmen having signed an agreement for a term of years with a bosses' combine to run presses in "open" offices (that is, plants unorganized), and at the convention of the typographical union, in Cincinnati, last month, the printers retaliated by turning down the pressmen's claim for part ownership of the union label, and also adopted resolutions to the effect that when necessary all workers in the printing trade would be brought under their jurisdiction and in favor of the broadest possible form of industrial organization. The molders recently held their convention in Toronto and declared that they intended to absorb the brass molders, who are now affiliated with the metal polishers and brass workers, and the latter union held a convention in Providence last month and vigorously assailed the claims of the molders. The longshoremen decided to enlarge their sphere by organizing under their banner every worker on or along the seas, lakes and rivers, and the sailors object most strenuously. The latter are also opposing the hotel and restaurant employes who claim the right to organize the cooks and waiters. The A. F. of L. executive council has filed notice on the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (which is truly an international body, having twelve branches or crafts and 93,000 members in every part of the world, as well as over \$2,000,000 in the treasury), that the amalgamated body must yield jurisdiction to the machinists, blacksmiths and patternmakers in three branches on or before Oct. 1, or its American charter would be annulled. This action seems to indicate that the council has definitely taken its stand with the "autonomists." As the Review is being printed the carpenters are meeting in Atlanta. Their policy lately has been to organize the mill men, and are thus cutting into the field of the woodworkers' union. Much bitterness has developed between those two national bodies and there is no sign that it will be minimized. At least a dozen other minor organizations have locked horns over the "autonomy" question, and it is generally agreed that a final decision will have to be made at New Orleans. Some of the national officers engaged in these controversies predict that unless they have their way a split or secession movement will occur in the near future, but it is hardly probable that the trouble will be allowed to go to that extreme, although there are clouds forming on the Western sky that are likely to complicate matters.

During the past month the National Committee of the Socialist party has made public a set of resolutions relating to the incipient conflict between the A. F. of L. and the new American Labor Union. While the declaration of the latter body in favor of Socialism is hailed as a distinct step forward, the committee, as the official head of the body, declines to be drawn into the controversy that may develop on the industrial field. The committee takes substantially the same ground covered by the International Socialist Review in the July

number, and which meets with the endorsement of all Socialists and trade unionists who have given the modern labor movement careful study. The committee deplors the fact that antagonisms are likely to be created between economic organizations of labor, and points out that the Socialist party cannot afford to take sides in a matter of this kind, but will continue to use its best efforts to unite the workers industrially and politically. It must be admitted that the A. L. U. is making progress and is becoming popular in many quarters, so much so that many national organizations are hesitating to force their locals to give up affiliation in that body. Then the "autonomy" trouble in the Federation and its refusal to acknowledge and approve of Socialism as a working class principle naturally cause some unions to entertain a friendly feeling for the Western organization. The Federation executive council's action in turning down the brewers and in practically showing the door to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers is not calculated to strengthen the bonds of affiliation. The new Brotherhood of Railway Employees, organized along lines similar to the A. R. U., which is gaining power in the West, and the International Laborers' Protective Association, a broad-gauge organization which has begun to flourish during the past few months, were refused charters recently, and there are rumors that they will go into the A. L. U. if the New Orleans convention endorses the action of the council. The writer personally knows of a union of 1,500 members in Ohio that is discussing the advisability of joining the A. L. U., and reports from Missouri, Kansas and other States further South are to the effect that organizers from the West are having some success in planting locals. All these straws are important as showing how things are moving, and they indicate that it will be necessary to exercise considerable caution to prevent a fratricidal labor war.

The outlook for a largely increased Socialist party vote this fall is exceptionally bright. Reports in party papers and private advices from all over the country show that the present agitation is almost as great as in the early '90s, when the Populist movement sprang into prominence. The introduction of machinery, the centralization of capital into trusts, the increase of prices for necessities, the great strikes, the tyranny of the courts, the increase of woman and child labor and many other causes are serving to open the eyes of the working people as never before. Every Socialist speaker who can orate for five minutes is on a soap-box, and the demand is not half supplied. The West is ablaze with enthusiasm, and they are seriously talking about carrying Colorado, or at least polling such a vote that will give the capitalist politicians cold chills, and great progress is promised in Washington, California, Montana and several other States. In the East, Pennsylvania easily leads the procession. The State committee claims several Congressmen in the mining regions, and the anxiety displayed by Senators Quay and Penrose to end the strike seems to lend color to the contentions of the committee. In New York and the New England States and in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and the Middle West the campaign is being forced with unflagging interest. The Populist reform party has practically disappeared, and the De Leon party is

so busy chasing out more of its traitors that there is hardly a vestige left. tickets having been put up in only about half a dozen States. The field is left almost entirely open to the Socialist party, and as a clincher the large number of charters that are being issued by the various State committees and the steady accession of members is a sure sign that the Socialist party is forging to the front as rapidly as it is safe.

The Milwaukee Federated Trades Council has issued a call to central labor organizations in other cities for a convention for the purpose of forming a national body to map out uniform plans in carrying on local work, such as organizing, boycotting, advancing union label propaganda and securing advantages for labor through political action. This idea has been discussed for a number of years in different cities, but has never been given practical demonstration. The A. F. of L. executive council has refused to endorse the Milwaukee call, but it is not improbable that arrangements will be made to arrange conferences of city central body delegates at the A. F. of L. convention at New Orleans in November.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Important Announcement.

The co-operative company doing business under the name of Charles H. Kerr & Company, which publishes The International Socialist Review, the Pocket Library of Socialism, the Standard Socialist Series, and other Socialist party literature, is growing in membership at a more rapid rate than ever before, and a new plan has been adopted which will probably double the membership in a very few months. The company is incorporated under the laws of Illinois, with an authorized capital of \$10,000, divided into 1,000 shares of \$10 each. Six hundred of these are already sold to over 400 Socialists, most of whom hold just one share each. As already explained in these pages, the stock draws no dividends, but it carries the privilege of buying books at cost.

Heretofore we have in most cases issued shares only to those able to pay \$10 at one time, because of the urgent need of more ready money to supply the new books required by the Socialist movement. Just as we are going to press we have received two letters, one from a leader in our movement, whose name would be familiar to every one of our readers, who promises to assist us in securing the necessary capital for extending our work. The other is from an isolated Socialist in a small town in New York State, who has for some time held a single share of stock. He writes as follows:

"Yours of Aug. 21 is received. I herewith send you postoffice order for \$50, for which please send note at 6 per cent. About the first of October I expect to have five or six hundred dollars that I can loan you if I can get it any time I may want it by giving thirty days' notice. Yours for Socialism in our time."

The conclusion to be drawn from these two letters is that our company has pretty nearly passed the stage of being in constant distress for lack of the necessary capital and that we may set about the laying of broad foundations for the tremendous task before us of supplying the literature required to build up the Socialist party of America.

We have made no mistake in organizing on the co-operative basis, with the ownership widely distributed among owners of single shares. Every day brings added proof that our plan of supplying literature at cost to stockholders is carrying the message of clear-cut, uncompromising Socialism into new fields that could not otherwise have been reached. The one weak point in our system, however, has been that the new, struggling locals and the isolated Socialists who are carrying

on a ceaseless campaign against heavy odds—the very ones whom our co-operative plan would help the most, are the ones who cannot advance \$10 for a share of stock. That is why we are especially glad that we can at last see our way clear to make the offer of

A Share of Stock for \$1.00 a Month, Ten Months.

One dollar down, with the promise of paying a dollar a month until the full sum of \$10 is paid, will give you the privilege of buying books at our special rates to stockholders, the same as if you were the owner of a full-paid share. These rates are as follows: On the Madden Library, 50 cents a hundred postpaid; others pay \$1 a hundred. On the Pocket Library of Socialism, \$1 a hundred postpaid; others pay \$2.25 a hundred. On other paper-covered books, one-half retail prices, postpaid. On cloth-bound books, one-half retail prices by express at purchaser's expense, or 40 per cent discount if sent by mail. It will readily be seen that it will only be necessary to buy a dollar's worth of books a month at these prices and sell them at retail prices to take care of the monthly payments on stock without feeling them. There is not a Socialist local in the United States too weak to carry this plan through successfully. If 400 of them undertake it at once, our output of Socialist literature will soon be doubled and trebled, and our company will be in a position to supply the literature that the rapidly growing Socialist party will require if it is to keep its millions of converts in touch with its best and clearest thought.

Now is the time to take hold. We have letters upon letters from comrades saying they want to become stockholders, but have not the \$10. Here is the chance.

No Liabilities.

Our company is organized under the general Illinois corporation law, and this means that you are liable only for the \$10 that you subscribe; when that is fully paid in you cannot be held liable for anything further in any event. If you desire any further particulars, let us know.

The Origin of the Family.

Our new translation by Ernest Untermann of Frederick Engels' great book, entitled "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," is now ready. This book has long since been translated into nearly every civilized language except English, and thousands of American readers will enjoy and profit by it as soon as it can be brought to their attention.

For the student of social science "The Origin of the Family" is of great importance because it gives in condensed form the actual results of the investigations of the last half century into the beginnings of the marriage relation. It is no mere grouping of facts, but the data are dealt with by a hand that can use them. Thus the book is as useful to the Socialist propagandist as to the student. Any reader who

masters this work of Engels will be rid, once for all, of the complacent notion that things have always been as they are, and therefore must always remain so. He will also find himself better able to understand the complicated problem which must soon be faced of adjusting the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, to the radically different economic conditions which are near at hand. "The Origin of the Family" is published in the Standard Socialist Series in cloth binding, 218 pages, and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents.

Socialist Literature for Striking Coal Miners.

In this department of the International Socialist literature for July and August we explained the opportunity offered by the anthracite coal strike for the circulation of Socialist literature among the coal miners who have, at present, no money to buy, but plenty of leisure to read, and whose own personal experience enables them to grasp quickly the truth of the Socialist message. Our offer is that for any sums contributed we will send by express, prepaid, literature figured at our special stockholders' prices to active Socialists in the coal region who are vouched for by the Secretary of the State Committee of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania, and who can be depended upon to see that every piece of literature is used where it will do the most good. Contributions for this fund have, thus far been received as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$11.40
A stockholder, Chicago	3.00
Local Dayton, Ohio, Socialist party.....	1.00
C. C. Hitchcock, Ware, Mass.....	.80
C. Nelson, Braddock, Pa.....	.50
Lewis J. Mitchell, Holly, Mich.....	2.00
J. F. Whittemore, Salt Lake City, Utah.....	1.20
James Patton, Devils Lake, N. D.....	1.30
	<hr/>
	\$21.20

The literature already supplied to the striking field from this fund has been producing good results, particularly at Wilkes-Barre and Mauch Chunk, from which places we have enthusiastic reports.

A bulletin issued by the State Committee of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania shows that most encouraging progress has been made in the anthracite coal region. "No Democratic or Republican meeting has been held in all this region since the strike began, and in four counties of Pennsylvania with 200,000 inhabitants there will not be a capitalist political meeting held during this campaign, if the comrades of the nation will give us the ammunition to keep up the agitation or increase it."

More literature is urgently needed at once, and if contributions are sent promptly the literature will be distributed in time to show results in the November elections.

The Career and Conversation of John Swinton.

John Swinton, who died about a year ago, was a notable figure in the newspaper circles of New York City, and was conspicuous for his outspoken sympathy with the labor movement. He was never identified with the Socialist party, and his efforts were for the most part barren of direct results on account of the erratic notions which he took up from time to time.

His personality, however, was something far greater than his published writings, and the story of his life is highly interesting and instructive, throwing side lights on the economic and political development of America during the last fifty years. This story has been admirably told by Robert Waters, a lifelong friend of Swinton and an experienced writer, whose literary style is admirable. The book will be ready about Sept. 20, and the price, including postage to any address, will be 25 cents.

Marx's "Capital."

We recently imported 250 copies of the standard edition of Marx's "Capital," such as is sold in London at half a guinea and in New York at \$2.50. We offered these books to the general public at \$2.00, postpaid, and to our stockholders at \$1.30 by mail or \$1.00 by express. The demand has been so great that the entire edition is exhausted, and we have been obliged to send for another edition. A little delay in the filling of orders for this book will therefore be inevitable, since our new edition cannot reach us before the second week of October. Future orders from stockholders will be filled at the rate of \$1.20, including prepayment of expressage by us or \$1.00 if sent by express at the expense of purchaser. The retail price will remain at \$2.00, as before. This book is one that should be in every Socialist library, and our second edition ought to be exhausted even more rapidly than the first.


Another work which will be practically unique in the literature of Socialism is entitled "Capital and Labor." This work is written by a black-listed mechanic and is the plain talk of a workingman to his fellows. We believe it will prove one of the most effective propaganda works ever written.

The translation of Kampffmeyer's "History of the German Social Democracy" is proceeding rapidly and we expect to issue it before the coming of winter. This will prove a valuable addition to the library of every Socialist worker.

We expect that the work of translation will soon begin on Karl Kautsky's latest work entitled, "The Social Revolution." This is one of the most important writings of the great German Socialist, and will prove a valuable addition to American Socialist literature.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,

56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1902.

NO. 4.

How Much Have the Trusts Accomplished?

IN an article on the " 'Trusts' in the Light of Census Returns"* Mr. Wm. R. Merriam, Director of the Census, says: "Contrary to the general impression these great combinations do not control a very large part of the industrial output of the country." The general statement is more specifically defined: "The output of these combinations, although it seems enormous, does not represent much more than one-tenth of the total industrial product of the United States."

This tendency to minimize the "danger" of the trusts is quite characteristic of the bourgeois statesman, who is always looking out for popular sympathy and appreciation, and will necessarily represent the trusts as a "danger" and menace, ogle and octopus and what not. Mr. Merriam does it very eloquently in the article quoted. Many leaders of the bourgeois thought undoubtedly feel the constructive power of trusts, but only the boldest ones dare acknowledge it openly, for to them this constructive power means something entirely different from the socialistic conception—means only higher profits, higher personal gain, which it is wise policy to hide.

Be it as it may, we are here to criticize Mr. Merriam's statements, and not his socio-economic philosophy. A priori it would seem that that Mr. Merriam's data are above all suspicions, for he is at the head of the greatest statistical organization in the country, and this organization has made a special study of the American trusts, which study had been the basis of Mr. Merriam's article.

Yet we beg to differ with his conclusions. And in doing so, we will have to rely mainly upon the very same data, for unfortunately we have no private information as to the activity of the two hundred and odd trusts or "industrial combinations" now ex-

*The Atlantic Monthly, March, 1902, p. 337.

isting in the country. Yet our conclusions—we will say it in advance—will be entirely different.

First, a little arithmetic. The combined value of the products of the 183 industrial combinations reported is \$1,661,295,364. The combined "value of products of American industry, including custom work and repairing,"* is \$13,091,876,790, which gives to the industrial combination, 12.6 per cent, or more than one-eighth of total production; and when the problem we are dealing with is of such enormous magnitude, the reader will agree that the difference between an eighth and a tenth is not an unimportant one.

But a difference of 2.6 per cent (even amounting as it does to the petty sum of \$340,388,796), would hardly be sufficient to publicly contradict an authority like Wm. R. Merriam. Let us look at the problem a little more closely.

The total production of the manufacturing industry of the United States is divided into the following five classes:

Classes—	Number of establishments.	Value of products including custom work and repairing.
1. Hand trades	215,990	\$ 1,186,201,455
2. Government establishments	145	21,452,079
3. Educational, eleemosynary and penal institutions	402	10,573,785
4. Establishments with a product of less than \$500 a year.....	127,419	29,724,643
5. All other establishments.....	296,651	11,843,924,828
	<hr/> 640,607	<hr/> \$13,091,876,790

It will be evident at a glance that the second and third class government establishments, penal and educational institutions, etc., are beyond the power of trusts, beyond the influence of industrial concentration. The first class demands a great deal more attention.

Are we to speak of these 215,990 establishments as industrial establishments? Their activity as manufacture? Is any tangible consolidation of these establishments ever possible? To all these questions we have only one answer to give—a most emphatic "No!" Look at the composition of this class: 6,331 establishments are busy at bicycle and tricycle repairing, 51,791 at blacksmithing, 23,574 at boots and shoes custom work and repairing, 15,300 at house and sign painting, 12,243 at watch repairing, etc., etc.

*Twelfth census of the U. S. Census Bulletin, No. 122, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1901. Manufactures, Industrial Combinations.

*Twelfth census of the U. S. Census Bulletin, No. 150, Washington, D. C., March 14, 1902. Manufactures: United States.

Even a bourgeois statistician acknowledges the point we are making. Says Mr. S. N. D. North, chief statistician for manufactures, who prepared the Census Bulletin on Industrial Combinations* : "If from this total we subtract the value of the products of the hand trades, or the mechanical and neighborhood industries, which are not susceptible to the form of management known as the industrial combination, we have a residuum," etc.* And so we must eliminate the value of hand trades products.

We might also go into a heated argument about the fourth class establishments, which hardly deserve that name, for they have a yearly product of less than \$500 each, and an average production of \$233 each. Establishments of such dimensions were thought so unimportant that no previous census had ever undertaken to report them. However, we shall not try to appear too parsimonious, and will let them have the \$29,724,643. How do the trusts stand now?

Their production is equal to \$1,661,295,364 out of \$11,873,649,471, which makes 14.83 per cent, or a little over one-seventh.

We shall not stop here, though, for we hope to be able to do a great deal more. Throughout his article Mr. Merriam never even mentions the fact that his data are very much antiquated, for they refer to the state of affairs as it existed on May 31, 1900. Since then more than two years have elapsed, and in the history of the trustification of American industries these two years have been most eventful ones. How young this movement towards concentration every American ought to know, and especially Mr. Merriam, for his own source of information—the much-quoted bulletin bears witness thereof. Of the 183 trusts enumerated in Table 3 (pp. 12-17), 20 were organized in 1898, 79 in 1899 and 9 in the first five months of 1900; 108 trusts, or almost 60 per cent, were organized during the twenty-nine months preceding the collection of data.

Has the formation of gigantic industrial corporations and consolidations stopped on May 31, 1900? If anything, it went on at an accelerated rate. The fact must be taken into serious consideration if we wish to get a truthful answer to the question: How much have the trusts accomplished? We have no absolutely correct statistical data for any later period than the end of May, 1900, it's true. But an approximate calculation may readily be made. At any rate, Mr. Merriam should have acknowledged the limitation of his figures, and should have used the past tense and not

*I. C., p. 7.

*At the time Mr. North prepared this Bulletin the data for the combined industries and the complete value of products were not ready. Mr. North, therefore, started to calculate the relation of the value of trust products in 1900 to total value of products in 1890, and in doing so, thought it necessary to eliminate the hand trade production, in order to obtain the proper percentage.

the present, when making those positive assertions we quoted above.

The most authoritative financial organ of America, The Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, at the end of every year publishes a complete list of all the industrial combinations for that year, with data as to capitalization, etc. The definition of an industrial combination of this newspaper is almost identical with the official one.

In the issue of this newspaper for March 5, 1900, the capitalization of all the existing industrial combinations at the end of 1899 is estimated at \$3,803,872,000. As the capitalization of the 183 trusts is given by the census statistician on May 31, 1900, as \$3,607,539,200, the approximate correctness of the Journal of Commerce's estimate (which was made three months in advance of the collection and two years in advance of the publication of the official figures) is no less than surprising.

In the issue of this paper for December 30, 1901, the following estimates are printed:

Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1899	\$2,663,445,000
Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1900	945,195,000
Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1901	2,805,475,000

Total capitalization of trusts organized within
the three years 1899-1901 \$6,414,115,000

Allowing, however, for possible duplicates, as many industrial combinations went through several reorganizations within these three years (the organization of the United States Steel Corporation from several component trusts being a notable example), the conservative Journal of Commerce takes \$5,000,000,000 as a figure that is nearer to the actual results of three years' consolidation. This estimate is rather below than above the truth. The total capitalization of all the industrial consolidations at the end of 1901 the Journal of Commerce estimates at \$6,500,000,000.

It is only a newspaper estimate,* you may say with contempt. We saw, however, how closely these estimates approached the results of careful statistical enumeration. This last estimate of six and one-half billions was made on the very same day that the Census Bureau in Washington announced its figures about the industrial consolidations, and could not therefore have been influenced by them. We can easily check the approximate accuracy of this guess.

On May 31, 1900, the combined capitalization of the 183 trusts

*As a matter of fact, the Journal of Commerce does not estimate at all in the popular conception of the word. It prints complete lists of organized combinations with their capitalization. The estimating consists only in reducing the sum by allowing for duplications.

was, according to the Census, \$3,607,539,000. The trusts organized in 1900 had a capitalization of \$945,195,000, and we can safely allow one-half of this sum for the trusts organized during June-December, 1900 (seven months). Capitalization of trusts organized during 1901 was \$2,805,475,000. We therefore get:

At the end of May, 1900.....	\$3,607,539,000
June-December, 1900	472,597,000
1901	2,805,475,000
	<hr/>
	\$6,885,611,000

which is within 5 per cent of the newspaper's estimate. We think it close enough to satisfy the most fastidious statistician.

Enough has been said, we think, to justify the assertion that the capitalization of American trusts at the end of 1901 was six and one-half billion dollars; at least that much, if not considerably higher.*

What is the significance of this statement for the problem we are trying to solve? Only this: If a capitalization of 3,607 millions corresponds to a production of \$1,661,295,367, a simple 'rule of three' operation will show that a capitalization of 6,500 millions will correspond to a production of \$2,993,739,913, which constitutes 25.2 per cent, or more than one-fourth of the total value of products of American industry.

The objection might certainly be raised that the total value of products in 1902 is larger than in 1900. Theoretically the objection is valid. Practically, however, such increase is not very probable, if we may judge from the fact that exports of products of American manufactures have decreased from 433 millions in 1899-1900 to 403 millions in 1901-1902. Yet we do not want to seem biased in favor of our view. As the value of products has increased within the decade 1890-1900 from \$8,156,272,123 to \$11,873,649,471, or 45 per cent, we will allow a further increase of 9 per cent for the last two years, which will give for the total value of products \$12,942,277,923, and as the share of the trusts 23.2 per cent—still near enough to call it a fourth.

The conclusion at which we arrive at the end of this tedious study is this: At the time when the statistics of the Twelfth Census was collected (May 31, 1900) fully one-seventh (and not, as Mr. Merriam states, one-tenth) of the American industry was consolidated. At the time, however, when Mr. Merriam wrote his article one-fourth of all American manufactured products were trust-made products!

*The Democratic Campaign Text Book contains the list of industrial combinations and securities holding companies compiled by Mr. John Moody, of New York. This list contains the names of 287 corporations, with a capitalization of \$6,972,448,857.

We will not yield an inch of this ground. For, following the methods of the Census, we were much too conservative in our calculations. The official definition of an "industrial combination," though accurate enough for scientific purposes, was very exclusive for that very reason, and did not admit many important enterprises, which are nevertheless results of the consolidation tendency. The definition was as follows:

"For the purpose of the census, the rule has been adopted to consider no aggregation of mills an industrial combination unless it consists of a number of formerly independent mills which have been brought together into one company under a charter obtained for that purpose. We therefore exclude from this category many large establishments, comprising a number of mills which have grown up, not by combination with other mills but by the erection of new plants or the purchase of old ones.*

That under this rule gigantic establishments were excluded is evident. It will be sufficient to point to the old Carnegie Co.,* which was not included in the list of industrial combinations, though the capital of this company (to judge from what Carnegie himself received for his share in it), was almost \$600,000,000. Another important class of combinations which were left out by this definition were all the so-called "pools," the old-fashioned "trusts," etc., which have not been "brought together into one company under a charter obtained for that purpose," but have been brought together anyway. Under this rule the whole slaughtering and packing industry was not represented at all on the list of the industrial combinations, and yet for concentration and destruction of competition this industry has no equal.

Nor is this all. "There have been excluded from the statistics of the industrial combinations all corporations engaged in the manufacture and distribution of gas and electric light and power." This rule has been adhered to for the sake of avoiding some statistical difficulties, but economically there is no justification for it. Mr. North acknowledges that "a great many combinations on this branch of industry exist throughout the country." As a matter of fact, the gas industry is as completely consolidated as it possibly can be, and competition is eliminated. Yet the industry has a capital of 567 millions, and the value of its products is \$75,716,693. Both are included in the statistics of manufactures, but excluded from the statistics of "industrial combinations."

When all these limitations and exceptions are taken into consideration, will anybody deny that one-fourth is an extremely conservative estimate of the share the "trusts" have in the produc-

*Census Bulletin 122, p. 1.

*The data were collected long before the formation of the U. S. Steel Corporation.

*I. C., p. 2.

tion of American manufactures? Were we a little bolder, we would claim a third, and would then be not very far from truth.

Only consider what this conclusion means to the Socialist interpretation of economic evolution! In less than five years (1897-1901) one-fourth of all the manufacturing industry of the United States has been centralized in the hands of between two and three hundred corporations. And still the same process continues. How much longer will it take for the remaining 75 per cent to follow this example?

All this refers to manufactures only. Did space allow, we could draw a very similar picture in regard to transportation and mining, and perhaps in the near future we will do so. How much competition is there left in the anthracite coal industry? In silver, or copper, or iron ore mining? Or in the American railroads and street railways? When we come to agriculture, however, that is an entirely different story, which we hope to live to tell.

In conclusion, a few words *pro domo sua*. Time was when, in asserting his view of economic evolution, the Socialist had only one enemy to fight; the bourgeois' defense of the competitive organization of society, which to him looked normal and eternal. In our own midst, however, a new prophet has arisen, who, in his effort to overthrow the teachers, denies everything, including the process of industrial concentration. A greater part of Bernstein's book, with all its formidable array of statistical data, is given up to this purpose.

Personally, we have a very strong opinion of the value of those statistical data. The only thing they prove to us is the author's striking ignorance of the first principles of statistical science, and this we could prove easily enough had not Kautsky, Bebel and others done it sufficiently well.

For one thing, however, we must give due credit to Bernstein. Having arrived at what to him seemed a new view of economic development, Bernstein made a perfectly proper effort to prove it scientifically, i. e., by study of actual conditions, and their developmental tendencies. Argue as much as we may about economic materialism, dialectics, fatalism, causation and what not, it is with the second, larger, part of Bernstein's book that his theories stand

*Says Thos. W. Phillips, member of the U. S. Industrial Commission: "American railroads, whose monopoly character is daily becoming more apparent, are stocked and bonded for about \$11,500,000,000 and had net earnings from operation after paying taxes, 1900-1901, of \$507,966,710. This means that these securities are to-day worth in the market over \$10,000,000,000. If we add to this the \$4,000,000,000 of water, gas, electric light, street railway and telephone securities, probably worth that much in the market, and the \$3,000,000,000 of securities of our largest so-called trusts, to say nothing of the telegraph, there looms up a valuation of industries more or less monopolistic in character of \$17,000,000,000, or probably one-fifth of what the present census will find to be the estimated true value of all property in this country."

Final report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. XIX., of the Commission's Reports, Washington, 1902, Industrial Combinations, Statement of Thos. W. Phillips, p. 685.

or fall—in the light of scientific statistics easily fall. Bernstein does not try to be dogmatic. Here, in New York, we have now our home product in the line of “criticism,” however. But, as a follower of the Bernstein school above all denies the universal law of equal capitalist development for all countries, does the American “Bernstein school” try to prove Bernstein’s theories by a careful study of American conditions? Not at all. Tiresome repetition of Bernstein’s arguments and assertions, hair-splitting criticism in the domain of value, economic materialism and ethics proves to be easier and pleasanter than a careful study of statistical tables. Or is it because the “critics” are afraid of the results of such careful study?

For the formidable process of industrial consolidation and concentration in the United States is easily studied and easily proved. Though a Socialist, Bernstein may deny it, one need not be a Marxist to acknowledge it. If I may be permitted to quote from a personal letter, here is what Mr. S. N. D. North, Chief Statistician for Manufactures of the Twelfth Census, says on this question: “You are quite right in the supposition that in almost all of the great lines of industry the tendency is to a decrease in the number of separate establishments accompanying a large increase in the amount of capital invested, number of employes and value of products.”

Yet those are all assertions, the truth of which a Bernstein will contest.

DR. I. M. RUBINOW.

Socialism and the American Farmer.

THE agrarian question has always been one upon which there has been great difference of opinion among Socialists. Various theories of the economic development of the farming industry have led to diverse positions in practical tactics. Some Socialists have maintained that the farmer was being steadily transformed into a tenant or mortgaged dependent and that his exploitation must come through the landlord and the money lender. But usury and tenantry are remnants of a pre-capitalistic stage of industry, and if such a movement existed it would tend to support the contention of bourgeois economists who hold that since agriculture is evolving in an opposite direction from factory industry it must constitute an insuperable obstacle to the success of Socialism. That landlordism and mortgage indebtedness does exist to so large an extent in farming is rather a proof of the backwardness of the industry than of its evolution toward a co-operative stage.

Another theory of development, which still finds credence in many localities (see, for example, the present platform of the Socialist party in Nebraska), holds that the great farm is devouring the smaller and that the farmer is destined to become a wage-worker on a great bonanza farm.

One of the fundamental principles of Socialist economics is that exploitation of the producer is inherent in the nature of the productive process. Unless this can be shown to hold true for agriculture we must admit that there is a different law of exploitation, and hence, in all probability, a different law of development and a different ultimate goal for that industry.

Before committing ourselves to any conclusion, let us examine the facts as set forth in the last census of the United States. Taking first the question of concentration, we find that while the average farm has grown somewhat in size during the last decade, being now 146.6 acres, against 136.5 in 1890, it is still somewhat smaller than in 1870, or in any year previous to that time, and is not yet as large as the 160 acres which makes up the "homestead" of the Western States. This increase in size is easily accounted for by the increase in the number of such homesteads, together with the few great ranches and Indian reservations operated by the government, but which are wholly abnormal developments, having no relation to the evolution under discussion. In the older States, where capitalism has been longest established, there is no tendency whatever toward concentration in farm ownership, as indicated by the growth of large farms.

Notwithstanding these facts, I am not wholly ready to admit that this line of evolution is forever closed. Some recent mechanical developments in the farming industry may possibly have some important effects on this point. Up to the present time no great success has attended the efforts to apply other than horse power to the fundamental agricultural operations. This has been especially true of plowing. Almost all attempts in this direction have depended upon the use of either two fixed engines with a cable, to which the plows were attached, which was too cumbersome to offer any great advantage over horse power, or else upon a traction engine dragging ordinary plows behind. In the latter case the engine buried itself as soon as it struck loose ground and became useless. A new invention substitutes revolving steel discs for the plowshare and attaches the power directly to the disc. It would seem that this device overcomes the objections to the previous instruments. A second great invention from which much is expected is the combined harvester and thresher, which is now in use in many localities where climatic conditions permit the grain to ripen on the growing stalk. Another great obstacle to the utilization of mechanical power in farming has been the lack of a cheap, light and strong motor. The host of inventors now working on automobile motors seem about to solve this problem. Should these mechanical advances prove successful, a considerable extension of farming on a large scale would seem probable.

Another obstacle to the growth of the farm unit which bids fair to be removed in the near future is the lack of pressure, so to speak, upon capital. While room remains for its investment in other enterprises, capital shows little inclination to enter the field of agriculture. But the vast increments of surplus value now accruing to the capitalists of the United States is bound before long to reduce the rate of interest in industry and force capital to flow into all productive fields. It therefore follows that we will soon see much greater efforts than have been made hitherto to capitalize farming. This tendency will be accelerated by the further fact that the tendency, to which I have called attention elsewhere, of various steps in agricultural production to be taken from the farm, seems to have about reached its limit, as no processes remain which do not demand close physical connection with the soil. Hence all this pressure which has hitherto been diverted from the actual cultivation of the soil will now be applied directly to the primary processes of production. Notwithstanding all these facts, I am inclined to think that the process of concentration through the absorption of small by larger farms is too distant to have any appreciable effect upon present con-

ditions or to demand attention in discussion of present Socialist tactics.

On the question of tenantry, a quotation from the *Seattle Socialist* will give a good idea of the position of many Socialists. The quotation is taken from an article very properly entitled "An Excited Editorial," for it certainly does look as if some one was excited when it was written. It is written in reply to what is alleged to be an "attack" by the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. I can assure the *Socialist*, however, that there is a distinction between an attack and a difference of opinion, and that one of the last papers I would ever think of attacking would be the *Socialist*. Here is a quotation which the *Socialist* repeats from a previous number in order to emphasize and justify it:

"The truth is, the farmer is on his way to become a farm laborer. While he still imagines himself a proprietor, the majority of his class are either on mortgaged or rented farms, practically only laborers. These sell their labor power for a bare subsistence and are subject to immediate discharge like wage laborers. The tendency toward large farms is not marked. But the tendency toward capitalist ownership of all the small farms is very marked."

Here are five distinct assertions. Three can be shown to be wholly wrong; one is doubtful, and one, "the tendency toward large farms is not marked," we have already shown to be true. Let us test these statements in the light of the facts as brought out in the census of 1900. A superficial examination lends some support to the position of the *Socialist*. The per cent of farms operated by owners has decreased from 74.5 in 1880 to 64.7 in 1900. It is one of the commonest sayings concerning statistics that "nothing is more deceptive than percentages," and it is seldom we find a better illustration of the truth of this statement. When we examine the absolute number of farms we find that there are 1,730,065 more farms now than twenty years ago. In this same period the number of farms operated by owners has actually increased 729,065. During the same time about one million new farms have been brought into cultivation under the tenant system. With the number of farm owners increasing 24 per cent in twenty years, it should be evident that whatever else may be happening, there is no sign of farm owners being transformed into tenants on any extensive scale.

The *Socialist* was particularly severe in its condemnation of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for saying that the farmers are in about equal danger from the coming of the next ice age and from conversion into a race of mortgage and tenant farmers. If tenantry alone is to be considered, I am free to admit that the statement needs revision, for if these statistics show anything it

is that taking the United States as a whole farmers will become a race of tenants at exactly the same time and place that two parallel lines meet.

But this is only a part of the story of tenantry. A study of the census statistics by geographical divisions shows that where agriculture has been longest established, there tenantry is least developed and is growing the least, if at all. In New England the percentage of farm owners to total farms varies from 79 per cent in Rhode Island (which has but 6,000 farms) to 95 per cent in Maine, where there are 59,000. No New England state shows any decrease in the total number of farm owners during the last ten years. New York is the only important Eastern state offering any exception to this rule. Here the number of farm owners is actually decreasing, they having fallen off 20,714 from 1880-90, and 7,955 from 1890-1900. Two important facts, however, prevent the drawing of any general conclusions as to increase of tenantry from these figures. First, the rate of increase appears to be declining rapidly, and, second, an examination of the total numbers of farms cultivated shows that these are growing fewer each decade, which would indicate that agriculture in New York was rather declining rapidly than evolving toward a higher and more capitalistic plane.

In the North Central division the percentage of tenants varies considerably. It is highest in Illinois and Iowa, where the percentage of farm owners sinks to 60 and 65 per cent respectively. Even in these states it must be noted that there is a small increase in actual number of farms operated by owners. A possible explanation of this situation may be found in the fact that favorable markets, and an extremely fertile soil, combined with a highly developed system of dairy farming, has made the farm income of these two states so large that there is still room for a class of small parasitic landlords to exist between the great capitalist exploiter and the actual tiller of the soil. This explanation finds support in the fact that the small towns of this region are made up almost entirely of "retired farmers," who are living upon the rent of the farms which they formerly operated. If this were really a growing movement it would be in decided opposition to Socialist philosophy, because it would indicate the rise of a new and permanent middle class.

Furthermore, the greatest percentage of tenantry in the United States is in precisely that region in which agriculture is most backward—the Black Belt. It would probably be generally agreed that the two states most backward in their agricultural conditions are Mississippi and South Carolina, with Alabama close behind. Now it so happens that it is in just these three states that tenantry reaches its highest point; the proportion of

farms operated by owners in these three states, in the order named above being as follows: 37.6, 39 and 42.3. Yet even in these states there is a continuous and quite rapid increase in the number of farm owners, indicating that tenant farms are made up of farms newly brought into cultivation, and that so far from owners becoming tenants, there is much more reason to believe that many tenants are becoming owners. All general conclusions as to this locality, however, must be modified by consideration of the peculiar history and present racial and social conditions, phases of the subject impossible to treat at this time.

The only region in which farming has reached a higher stage of development than in the Eastern market garden states is in the wheat belt of the far West. Taking North Dakota as an example of the conditions prevailing in this region, we find 91 per cent of the farms are operated by owners and that the absolute number of owners is increasing very rapidly.

Nebraska and Kansas offer the most striking exceptions to the general rule, being almost the only states of any importance to show an absolute decline in the number of farms operated by owners. Perhaps an explanation of this condition is found in the fact noted by Prof. Edwin Earle Sparks in the September *Chautauquan* that in these two states the "frontier" has, for the first time in the history of America, retreated. The whole western portion of these two states has been depopulated, owing to continued drought. Says the article referred to above: "Thousands of acres lie in these districts belonging to loan and trust companies, while many tracts have been abandoned and offered for sale for taxes....It is practically returned to 'wild' country, though not to the national domain....Lines of posts with occasional strands of wire, dry irrigation ditches, and abandoned dug-outs or sod houses show where overconfident man has retreated from the unequal contest." As I have shown in my treatment of this region in "The American Farmer," there have been other than physical causes at work in this advance and retreat of the frontier, but at any rate it will scarcely be claimed that this region represents a typical development toward the highest capitalist stage.

Washington shows an increase in the number of farm owners of nearly 12,000, or about 75 per cent, during the last ten years, while Oregon's farm owners have increased more than fourfold in the last twenty years, from which it would appear that the agricultural conditions in the locality of the *Seattle Socialist* had neglected to follow its economic philosophy in their evolution.

One thing which is incidentally apparent on this point is that as a general rule Socialism is growing in just those states where tenantry is least developed. This is what would naturally be ex-

pected by anyone who realized that tenantry is a sign of degeneration and not of advance.

The statistics of mortgaged farms have not yet been published. But I feel perfectly safe in predicting that when published they will show that the absolute number of farms free from incumbrance was greater in 1900 than in 1890. In this country mortgages have been quite largely incurred as security for the purchase price, and the tendency is for the borrower to become the owner. Thus it is seen that there is no sign whatever of the farmer being "on his way to become a farm laborer." It is at least doubtful if a "majority are either on mortgaged or rented farms," and there is no trace of the "tendency toward capitalist ownership of all the small farms." With these few exceptions, the basis of "The Excited Editorial" can be accepted. All this talk of landlords and money lenders belongs to Populism and not to Socialism, and should be left to the dying remnant of that party.

Such talk implies that if the farmer could once succeed in freeing himself from debt and the landlord he would be an "independent farmer," free from exploitation. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that ownership of a farm is no protection whatever from the real basic exploitation, then such ownership will cease to allure, and the farmer may be made to see his affinity with the wage-working proletarians of the shops and mines. If the farmer can escape from exploitation, while capitalism still remains, then he has no interest in its abolition. But if, on the other hand, it can be shown that his exploitation, like that of the wage-worker, is absolutely inherent in the capitalist system and cannot be abolished while that system remains, then he is ripe for the Socialist propaganda.

The question of the real nature of the process by which the farmer is exploited becomes then of greatest importance, for that he is exploited no one can deny who will study into his present conditions and past history. The wage-worker possesses but a single commodity—labor power—which is valueless unless instantly marketed. This commodity must be sold to a class who own the wage-workers' means of existence. The continuous presence of an army of unemployed renders this labor power subject to almost perfect competition, which reduces its price to the cost of production.

The position of the farmer is almost exactly analogous. With the removal of a large portion of the essentials of agriculture from the farm, he is reduced to the possession of labor power in only a trifle more developed and more permanent form than the unused strength and skill of the wage-worker. He, too, must sell this product to a class that have possession of the things essential to his existence. The thing which has been hitherto over-

looked in his case, however, is that in the disposal of this partially created product he, too, is subject to an unlimited competition analogous to the wage-workers' army of the unemployed. Perhaps the reason for this oversight lies in the fact that his army of the unemployed presents itself in a less dramatic form, consisting as it does in the almost endlessly expansible resources of nature.

The idea has in some way become current in the United States that the period of rapid extension of farm area in this country is past. It may surprise some people to learn that more than 218,000,000 acres were added to the farm area of the United States during the last ten years. This is almost twice as much as was ever added in any previous decade, even in the years when the great migrations were being made into the states of the Mississippi Valley and the Great Plains, and more than twice the total farm area of all the states bordering on the Atlantic Ocean. All this in the face of the fact of the "retreat of the frontier," to which reference has been previously made. It is estimated that there are over 160,000,000 acres in Canada which are suitable for farming purposes and which are being settled at a most remarkable rate. The irrigation movement, to which the general government has just lent its assistance, contains almost boundless possibilities of expansion. The value of the irrigated crop for 1899 was \$86,860,491, or almost as much as the combined crop of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut, and it must be remembered that the growth in the three years since then have been by far the most rapid in the history of the irrigation movement. In other regions, new methods, coupled with partial irrigation, are adding immensely to the area of productive land, and to the productiveness of that already under cultivation.

New crops have the same effect. Macaroni wheat alone promises to almost double the wheat-producing capacity of the United States.

The utilization of what have hitherto been waste products operates in the same manner. If more can be raised on the same area, or greater value secured from existing crops, then the margin of cultivation is forced lower, competition grows fiercer, and the pressure forcing the farmer toward the subsistence point grows heavier. The marvelous discoveries recently made in the utilization of corn, both grain and fodder, illustrate this fact.

Socialists have long pointed out how every improvement in the tools of production helps to keep wage-workers closer to the subsistence point. That they are able to resist this tendency to some extent through organization does not argue against the existence of the tendency. But what has been hitherto overlooked is that the same law is operating upon the farmer. Every

year sees almost every machine used in agriculture made more productive. This simply means that the margin of cultivation can be forced a little further, and a little larger product be thrown upon the competitive market.

The importance of this point, if true, can scarcely be over-estimated, as it contains the key to the whole question of the exploitation of the farmer. If a society is to be perfectly competitive, there must necessarily be within that society no instrument of production which cannot be secured with equal ease by every individual. The moment a tool is introduced, requiring the co-operation of two or more men for its operation, while individual ownership still remains, free competition is destroyed, because one must then secure the machine and thereby have the others at his mercy. As soon as co-operative production became dominant, the owners of the necessarily monopolized tools were able to take from the non-owners, who were exposed to the full force of competition, all save subsistence. The process of evolution has now practically abolished free competition everywhere save among the actual producers of wealth, whether these be wage-workers or farmers. Under these conditions the interests of these producers who are thus exposed to free competition becomes identical in their opposition to the owners of the monopolized means of exploitation.

This is really no new theory, but is simply the extension into the field of agriculture of principles now generally recognized as operating in other fields of production.

Some important deductions as to tenants arise naturally from this line of reasoning. If the exploitation of the farmer comes fundamentally through landlordism and usury (neither of which are an essential of capitalistic production), then he was right when he sought relief in depreciation of currency and tinkering with banking and credit systems, because as a tenant or borrower he was fundamentally a member of a debtor rather than an exploited class.

If, on the other hand, the analysis here made is correct, then he is not primarily interested in any struggle between the debtor and creditor class, since his exploitation takes place, not in the field of exchange, but of production, and the abolition of usury and landlordism would not relieve him from exploitation. This position gains something of support from the fact that the capitalist class of this country (which may be generally depended upon to be fairly class-conscious) has used all the governmental powers which it possesses to maintain the existence of small farms operated by owners. The fact that it has been fairly successful in line has just been shown by the figures quoted from the last

census. The homestead law and the provisions of the recent irrigation act are instances in point.

This analysis has an important bearing upon some other questions of tactics—particularly upon the desirability of the step-at-a-time movement through “state Socialism,” or rather “state capitalism.” To make myself clear upon this point I would ask the reader to consider for a moment the whole productive process of society as a single organic movement. Accept for a moment the hypothesis of organic sociology upon this one point, and consider society as a gigantic organism engaged in the production of goods for the satisfaction of its needs. Considered in this manner, it will at once be seen how completely this productive process is dominated by the operation of a few essential industrial processes which have now reached the stage of monopoly. Just how complete this domination is at present is shown by the very excellent article of Dr. Rubinow, which appears elsewhere in this number. The owners of these dominant industrial processes, themselves shielded from the forces of competition, absorb to themselves, not simply the surplus values of the workers directly employed in the monopolized processes, but of all those workers who are engaged in the unmonopolized fields, but who are unable to complete their production without the use of the monopolized processes.

The important deduction which follows from this position is that the removal of any one of these dominant monopolized industries from private ownership to governmental ownership and operation would simply add to the profits of the monopolized processes still in the field of private ownership. To illustrate: If railroads, telegraphs and telephones were nationalized and run at cost, the returns from the operation would, by force of government, be reduced to the same level with the industries still in the field of free competition. The productive field would then, as now, be divided into two portions, one of which would be under private monopoly, as at present, and the other would be again divided into two parts, according to the manner in which the monopoly element was taken out. In one of these parts it would be squeezed out by pressure of competition, in the manner already described, and in the other it would be removed by legal enactment. In either case the owners of private monopoly would, as at present, absorb all the surplus value produced. This theory finds its justification in the practical working out of state capitalism in every country where it has been tested. As an incidental force tending to hasten this result, it should be noted that every industry removed from the monopoly field into the governmental field would release a large amount of capital, and thus hasten the monopolization of the field hitherto competitive.

Hence as long as a single industry remained in the field of private monopoly all the efforts to abolish the monopoly element in other fields would but add to the power of this one monopolized industry to absorb the surplus value produced by the remainder of society. Since any industry could be transferred to the monopoly field and thereby acquire the power to absorb surplus value for its owners, which employs tools requiring the co-operation of several persons, it really means that so long as the producers of labor power (the laborers in any line of industry) were outside the process of nationalization they would be exploited as at present.

If, now, this argument is in any degree sound, it offers additional support to my position that farmers must find their political interests best expressed by the party which best expresses the interests of the wage-working proletarians. I would offer this as a partial answer to the position taken by Comrade Kautsky in the September REVIEW. In this connection it is hardly necessary to explain to our American readers the defect in that portion of his argument which implies an independent agrarian party making alliances with the Socialist party. The history of this country shows that at no time have there really been more than two great political parties really contending for the mastery. The principal reason for this is a peculiarity in the form of government of the United States, which I do not remember ever being pointed out before in just this connection. This is the only country in the world of any importance whose chief magistrate is subject to popular election. This makes that office the highest prize offered in any political struggle in the world. No political party in America can hope to maintain a continuous existence, unless it holds out to its members at least the possibility of some time securing this first prize. Consequently a permanent third party, taking part in alliances and dividing power with other parties is an impossibility. The growth of a "third party" must be sufficiently rapid to make it appear possible that the dominant position in politics will be attained by it in something like a near future. Recent developments in the legislative machinery of the national government make this point still stronger. Under the system of committee rule, and autocratic domination of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority party rules with practically despotic power. An opposing minority, even if a powerful one, has little power in legislation, and a third party has practically no influence whatever. Under these circumstances the possibility of a large number of political parties playing any part in our political life, as is the rule in Europe, is excluded.

Our presidential elections always turn, nominally at least, on some one issue. As soon as capitalism is no longer able to ignore

Socialism, there will be but two parties in the field—a Socialist and anti-Socialist. The farmer will then be forced to choose between them. That he will choose the Socialist Party, even if he considers it, as Comrade Kautsky says, “the lesser of two evils,” there can be little doubt. But the Socialist Party cannot afford to have him simply in this negative position. It needs his positive help, both now and in the period of reconstruction. Hence the pressing need of propaganda and educational work among the farmers of America.

A. M. SIMONS.

Government by Injunction.

THE frequency with which the equitable remedy known as the writ of injunction has been invoked in conflicts between Labor and Capital during the last ten years, with the seeming, if not avowed, object of hampering and injuring the cause of Labor, demoralizing their otherwise solid ranks and defeating them in their impending struggle for better conditions of life and work, has created a strong and ever-growing feeling of dissatisfaction and revolt against what is generally known as government by injunction, and a deep-seated mistrust for the courts and judiciary of the country. If the departure of the courts from their traditional impartiality in administering justice, and the abuse of the discretion and power vested in them, is true, there is a problem that confronts the people, which needs a fearless and careful consideration.

What Is an Injunction?

The writers on the subject of injunctions, and courts generally, define a writ of injunction to be a judicial order directed to a person or persons, requiring them to do or refrain from doing a particular thing. It may be used for the enforcement or prevention of wrongs.

In England and in this country, where the law was unwritten, but was being built up from customs, traditions and decisions of judges for centuries past, forming what has been known as the common law, there was found to be need of a tribunal and system of jurisprudence, which would offer a remedy for wrongs for which the rules of common law were inadequate. The rules of law which took root in the feudal system of England could not always answer the growing needs of the rising city population, merchants, individual property-holders and producers. With the appearance of new economic and social conditions, the courts of equity were trying to bring the law in harmony with the demands of society, which, during the seventeenth, eighteenth and early portion of the nineteenth century was made up largely of comparatively small producers, artisans and farmers, who owned their small patches of ground, and a few tools and implements of labor, and also owned the product of their toil. Production on large scale, by huge and complicated machinery, is only of recent origin. The difficulties which would arise between such independent artisans and producers, who were small property holders, would be adjusted by courts of equity, where the law had no remedy to offer. So, when a man would unlawfully obstruct by a dam a stream of flowing water, equity, at the suit of the party injured.

would compel the wrongdoer, by injunction, mandatory in character, to remove, and prohibitory in character, to abstain from further interfering, with the flow of the stream. Or, if one unlawfully erected a wall shutting out the light from another, equity would compel him to tear it down and to refrain from further interference with the other's right. It left the judge the arbiter of what was right and what was wrong. There was no danger in this power of the courts at that time. As long as the bulk of the people were small property holders, farmers and artisans, the administration of equity from the point of view of the small property holder was also the law, the enforceable right of the predominant class being at all times the law of the land. In these bygone days of our daddies, the judges picked and selected from among them, imbued with all the ideas of right and wrong, which the great majority of the people then entertained, placed upon the bench to administer justice, would apply the principles of common law or equity, guided by their own experience, which was the experience of the majority of the people, and by the standard of moral conception of justice, right and wrong prevalent at the time among the bulk of the nation.

But as a nation we have since undergone a most stupendous change in our methods of production. Large, extensive and most complicated machinery has taken the place of the crude and simple tools of two generations back, and with this a new arrangement of social classes has been introduced. Since the Civil War the rise of the nonproducing capitalist class to the commanding position in the economic, political and social life of our nation, where everything is made subservient to its wishes, where the great mass of the producers are at the mercy of a few men, who hold the means required to carry on the production of the necessities of life without which the nation cannot exist, has brought forward a new nation within American society, nameless though it may be, yet a nation, distinct from those who assume to think, act and represent the American people, a nation which commences to think for itself, to withdraw itself into a separate organization, a nation with new ideas of right and wrong, new ideals of social justice, a nation composed of men and women whose hearts beat for each other, who cherish the same hopes and aspirations for the future of their children and their children's children, who are bound together by the ties of social kinship, mutual interest and devotion, who are the homeless, nameless, propertyless multitude, which uses its brains and muscle in battling with the blind forces of nature, to create all the good things, human brains, hands and skill can produce for a modern civilization—the great Nation of Labor, the Working Class of America.

No sane man can honestly contend, at this stage of develop-

ment of the big combinations of capital, monopolies and trusts, that these combinations or their members and stockholders perform any useful or necessary function in the production of wealth, in the creation of which they are supposed to be engaged. How much steel has there ever been made by Morgan or the stockholders of the United States Steel Trust? How much coal has there ever been mined by the coal barons, who appropriated to themselves the misleading title of mine-"operators?"

It is the steel worker, the miner, etc., who, for living or starvation wages, in the sweat of their brows extract and shift and mould the crude things of nature into objects of common usage. The capitalist gets the cream of their labor. He pays them in wages, irrespective of what they create for him, what he can buy their labor power for on the market. It is natural that the laborer should be interested in getting as high a price for his labor power as he possibly can, and the capitalist in securing it as cheaply as he can. Hence the conflict between labor and capital, which takes the form of strikes, boycotts and lockouts.

Injunctions in Strikes and Lockouts.

The miners who cannot live on 90 cents a day, like one solid body, rise and demand an increase of wages. Their right to life is not questioned by the courts. The right of the mine-owners to what the law recognizes as their private property, and their right to use it as they please, is also unquestioned by the courts. The miner, however, cannot live without working, though the mine-owner can. The right of the one hundred and fifty thousand coal miners to life comes at once in conflict with the so-called right of private property by the few mine-owners, and with their right to use their mines as they please, to close or operate them.

Shall Equity help the few coal barons, who are troubled neither by hunger nor cold, to drive into submission a million of men, women and children? Or, shall it listen to the demands of American manhood and womanhood for a right to a decent life? If the law is inadequate to help the striking miners, shall not Equity step in and administer justice according to the demands of the new society, the new nation, the working miners and all other producers of the land?

But, the conception of justice by the courts, who attempt to administer equity, is far from the one held by the working people. Who are our judges? Are they men who go to the bench from the workshop, mine, factory or field? Are they men whose sympathies, feelings, ideas, thoughts and hopes are those of the producers? The fact is too well known. They are men who are picked from the faithful hangers-on and servants of the capitalist and property-holding class, from the ranks of corporation lawyers; men who, as a rule, look upon the laborer as a worthless, shiftless

and dangerous member of "society." Their sympathies and interests are bound up with the capitalist class, and they become its willing tools in the troublous times of strikes and boycotts. Since the memorable injunction issued by Judge Jenkins, of Milwaukee, some years ago, the injunction has been of more service to the capitalists in every strike of any kind or size, in defeating the striking working men, than the national guard or regular troops. In many instances the injunction has defeated strikers much more effectively than the police and regular troops could ever hope to accomplish. In their eagerness to serve their masters the courts have disregarded the constitutional rights of citizenship, brushed them aside, and thrown men into jail for disobeying an order prohibiting them from holding public meetings, or talking to their neighbors and discussing their grievances together, or assisting with food and money those who were in need of it. Many a union officer has been enjoined from distributing to the striking members the so-called relief funds they themselves have helped to create by years of contributions. The arrogance assumed by Judge Jackson in the West Virginia cases, in which Mother Jones, together with other organizers of the United Mine Workers' Union, were cited to appear for disobeying an order prohibiting them from holding meetings, can hardly be surpassed. The judge was careful to send the organizers to different county jails, and to suspend the sentence over that elderly woman who, by years of toil and devotion for the cause of the miners, has earned the name of "Mother." Judge Jackson only voiced the general sentiment of the judiciary of the country, when, in most severe and scathing terms, he arraigned labor organizations, their walking delegates and organizers.

Thus supreme reigns Capital. The troops, the militia and police, the courts and the whole machinery of government are at its disposal. Capital needed only to be crowned, receive the holy anointment, and continue to reign by the grace of God. This was attempted to be done by President Baer, of the Mine Owners' Association, when, in the capacity of a royal prelate, with bare head and arms upraised, he placed the crown upon the head of King Capital in these words: "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for, not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country."

The Remedy.

What shall be the remedy against so-called government by injunctions?

1. A system which permits one man, sitting as judge, to issue an order, try, judge and condemn another for the violation of his own order, is subversive of all principles of a free and democratic

form of government. Every person before being punished for the violation of any law or order of court, should have the right to a trial by a jury of his peers. Unless this principle is recognized in our jurisprudence, the courts will before long become a legal despotism, with which the so-called administrative orders of Russian czarism, sending men and women to Siberia without trial, could well compare. Contempt of court must be declared a crime, triable by a jury. The power of sending active strikers to jail and thus demoralizing the ranks of the striking workmen should be taken away from the judges. A bill for such a law was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature at its last session by James Carey, the Socialist Representative in the House. The combined efforts of the Republicans and Democrats, however, defeated the bill. But the attempt will be renewed as long as there shall be a Socialist in the House, and pressed again and again, until it becomes a law.

2. But such a law could not do away with the discretion of judges in granting injunctions. The judge, whose training, association and sympathies are with the employing class, is not apt to use his discretion in favor of striking workmen. Organized labor must look for a permanent and lasting remedy through the independent use of the ballot. The Nation of Labor is, and must be, at war with the small Nation of Capital. This must not be overlooked nor forgotten. On Labor day and before elections this small nation of Capital manages to sugar-coat the working population and lull them into self-destruction with eloquent orations and editorial diatribes on the Dignity of Labor, and keep itself in the possession of all the branches of government, executive, judicial, and legislative, re-enforcing itself at each and every election by the votes of these very working men, who become its willing slaves after election. The working men must learn that they can receive no justice until they themselves control and master all the branches of their government. They must separate themselves from the capitalist class on election day, as they do every day in the year in their trades unions. The American Federation of Labor will be helpless, unless there is an American Labor Party alongside of it to elect a President and Governors, who would send neither troops nor militia to intimidate and shoot down strikers, judges who would turn a deaf ear to capitalists clamoring for injunctions, and legislators who would pass laws placing the rights of person, life and labor above the supposed rights of capital, and, under the power of eminent domain, declare the mines, the railroads, and all other means of production and distribution the common property of the whole nation, engraft upon our laws the admonition, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread," abolish the system which breeds Morgans and Rockefellers on one side and

poverty and wretchedness on the other, and once more reassert the right of every man to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

Let every trades union and organization of labor fall in line and march hand in hand with the Socialist party to the polls on each election day, and a new page in the life-blood written history of American Labor will open, registering victory after victory in the onward march of the working class against the bulwarks of capitalism, until the whole structure of capitalism, with its government by injunction and bayonet, the rottenness, corruption and misery it creates, shall be replaced by the Republic of Labor.

GEO. B. LEONARD.

Minneapolis, Minn., Aug. 27, 1902.

Mr. Hennessey's Philosophy.

(A Rejoinder.)



CAREFUL reading of Julian's "Thus Spake Marxist" (in the June Review) has enabled me to decipher in it the cryptogram of Mr. Hennessey. He does not worry over "unknowable problems which cannot be fathomed by the finite mind of man." "Glory be to hiven!" says he. "All I'm goin' to do is to vote." And, says he, "I will vote as I shoot." "With ye'er eyes shut?" commented Mr. Dooley. "'Tis th' on'y way."

"He is in the procession (that is, Mr. Hennessey is), and cannot get out of it." How could he, with his eyes shut? Suppose, however, we look at things with our eyes open. What we are discussing is not the unconscious functions of the individual in society (only in that sense everybody may be said to be "in the procession"), but his conscious action, "class-conscious," if you please, with the emphasis on "conscious." And in this respect it is not true that everybody "is in the procession and cannot get out of it;" just the opposite, the complaint in this neighborhood seems to be, that you cannot get 'em into it.

The "class struggle," of which we hear so much spoken, demands sacrifice from the individual for the benefit of his class. I anticipate the trivial objection that there is really no "sacrifice," since the individual derives pleasure from his seemingly unselfish acts. Yet the Belgian workmen who were shot down in the recent general strike, or the Jewish workmen in Russia who were whipped into insensibility for participating in the May day parade, suffered bodily pain, and this is no pleasure, all utilitarian talk to the contrary notwithstanding. One may vote with his eyes shut, but can you believe that those Jewish workmen made arrangements for and joined in the procession (in the literal sense) without stopping to think of "the reason why?" The majority of the Russian workmen stayed at home, could those few not have done likewise, if they would?

No, they could not—says Mr. Hennessey—for they could not have willed otherwise than they did. This is another objection that misses the point at issue.

It is not maintained that their will was "free," it had a determining psychical cause, or many causes, and it is these causes that we are endeavoring to ascertain. If we understand right the psychology of these workmen, each one is actuated by the belief that his personal effort adds something to the movement, and that the more numerous are those who share his belief and act upon it, the

greater will be the effect. The moment this belief is gone political apathy must ensue; so it was in Russia through the dark days of the '80s, when pessimism and Tolstoyism held sway. So the belief that the individual can influence the course of events is essential to public activity of a non-pecuniary character. That this belief is in contradiction with the assumption of "historical laws," is evident to any one whose reasoning faculty is not carried away by his desire to score a point in debate. If every event, such as the weather during Columbus' journey, is foreordained by "historical necessity," how can the individual change an iota by his efforts? Looking backward, if the discovery of America was bound to come on the 12th of October, 1492, neither sooner, nor later, how could human skill have changed even as much at the date? And now, looking forward, if the social revolution is due on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of the year nineteen hundred and something, why should one jeopardize his daily bread and butter for the sake of it? The revolution will arrive on schedule time, rain or shine.

This is Mr. Hennessey's theory. , "Anything in history you do not understand?" says he in his familiar humorous vein—"say it was due to an accident and you are done with it." The implication is that there is not a thing "in heaven and earth" which is not accounted for in Mr. Hennessey's philosophy.

"What is an accident? And what is an accident not?" says he. Apparently, he has taken no cognizance of the development of historical science during the XIX. century. Our school books of history are full of episodical descriptions, i. e., of "accidents," modern philosophical treatises on history discard episodes and dates almost completely and concentrate their attention upon changes in the arts and mode of life, in institutions, religious beliefs, etc. The distinction between that which is "necessary" and that which is "accidental" has not originated with "Marxist," although it may have been from him that Mr. Hennessey first heard of it.

"In tracing the connection between phenomena—says Lavroff—as well as in ascertaining the distribution of forms, the first step always consists in distinguishing the more important from the less important. In phenomenological sciences, the naturalist can easily do it; what recurs in unvarying connection, is more important, for therein is the law; whatever relates to accidental modifications is of little importance and is noted merely for eventual reference at some future time. Probably no experimenter has ever found perfectly identical angles of refraction of light for the same medium, no one has obtained identical results by chemical analysis; but disregarding the accidental variations of the experiment, he

has discovered beneath them the invariable law of the recurrent phenomenon. That is the only thing that is essential."

"With man general laws alone are essential, not particular facts, because he understands a subject only by generalizing; but science with its general laws of phenomena is peculiar to man alone; without him there are only contemporaneous and consecutive chains of facts, so minute and particular that man can hardly perceive them in all their minuteness and particularity."*

What, then, is an accident? It is a particular variation of a recurrent phenomenon, something which has occurred once and may never occur again. It is unquestionably the effect of many minute causes, but they are unrelated to the recurrence of the phenomenon and are therefore disregarded in the generalization by which the scientific law is formulated. In this sense these variations are termed "accidental."

If you are conducting an entomological experiment and your laboratory is destroyed by a fire which started in the adjoining chemical laboratory, it is from the standpoint of the entomologist an accident. It does not mean that you do not know the cause of the fire; the fire may have been caused by an explosion which has been fully accounted for. But the cause of the fire is in no way related to the habits of the bugs under your observation, and for this reason it is for you an accident. Yet to the actuary of the insurance company it is no accident at all, it is but one of the recurrent phenomena comprised in his calculations. The distinction wholly depends upon the point of view; without such distinctions, however, no scientific analysis is possible.

Applying these propositions to a historical event, like the discovery of America by Columbus, on October 12, 1492, we can there discern certain features which are "necessary" or essential, and others which are "accidental." That the progress of astronomy and navigation was bound to result in the discovery of America, is plain enough; Norsemen had been on this continent centuries before; Columbus was not the first to seek the maritime route to India. So the discovery of America (an abstraction of our mind) was "historically necessary;" the concrete fact, however, that Columbus landed here on the 12th of October, 1492, was an "accident." It was due, says Mr. Hennessey, to favorable weather; precisely, but favorable weather was a fact over which astronomy and the art of navigation had no command. Unless it had been written beforehand in the Book of Destiny that Columbus was to land on the 12th of October, 1492, "two o'clock, three sharp," in Chicago justice court parlance, it is impossible to see how this chronological date can be accounted for by any "historical" or sociological law.

*P. Lavroff; *Historische Briefe*.

The attempt to smuggle in a distinction between "event" and "accident," and to construct upon it an imaginary contradiction, is certainly a clever move, which will be fully appreciated by all lovers of poker. Says Mr. Hennessey: "The laws of social development do not unfold themselves to us through all the events of our individual and collective careers, but only through the accidents of our individual and collective careers" (p. 846). The proposition is funny, but that is Mr. Hennessey's way. In the article he pretends to quote from, the words "event" and "accident" are used synonymously. To the sociological student every historical "event" is an "accident;" it is only in our mind that certain features of the event became detached from their associations and joined to similar features of other events, similarly detached from their associations; the outcome of this mental operation we call a sociological law.

Mr. Hennessey complains that the writer has not made it clear to him "what distinction he (Marxist) draws between 'laws of social development' and 'laws of history.'" Unfortunately, Mr. Hennessey reads as he votes—with his eyes shut—or else he could find the answer in the very article he criticizes, on p. 734 of the "Review:"

"There are no laws of history in the ordinary sense of the word, the so-called 'laws of history' being meant for sociological laws." Since the writer denies the existence of "laws of history" (the term being used throughout the article in quotation marks), it is hoped that he will be excused from "making clear" a "distinction," where there is no distinction. The ambiguity of the term "history" is responsible for the unscientific pretension to account for every concrete detail of an actual fact by "historic necessity." The Filipinos rose up against Spain about the time of the Spanish-American war—"historic necessity." Why? Because the Filipinos were in the revolution-making business (established 'way back), and, like shrewd business men, would not have missed such a chance for anything. Yet we know that the Poles "were in a state of rebellion most of the time "since the last partition of Poland; many a diplomat "anticipated an uprising" of Poland during the Crimean war, when the outlook for it was more favorable than either in 1831 or in 1863, when revolutions actually broke out; still it must have been "historic necessity" that the memories of Lord Palmerston and Napoleon III. should be put into shade by the foresight of Mr. Hennessey.

A sociological law is nothing but a generalization of the recurrent features in actual events; those features which do not recur, are not included in the generalization; consequently, it is futile to seek their explanation in sociological laws. All such variations can be accounted for by acts of individuals, due to in-

dividual causes, which are wholly unrelated to the sociological law in question. The sociologist disregards these variations, though each of them may affect the lives of two or three generations; yet to the sociologist two or three generations of men are the same as to the entomologist two or three generations of grasshoppers.

In a democracy like the United States the part played by the individual in historical events is less susceptible to observation than in an absolute monarchy where only a few individuals perform active political functions. An example taken from the recent political history of Russia will therefore serve best to illustrate the preceding propositions.

On the 13th of March, 1881, at 12:30 p. m., Czar Alexander II. approved a bill calling for a constitutional convention, and ordered it to be promulgated. Two hours later he was assassinated and his successor refused to carry out his father's policy. These are historical facts. Is it pure speculation to ask, what would have happened had the plot to assassinate the Czar miscarried on that particular day? Similar attempts failed more than once, before and after. The Czar was an old and sickly man; a slight indisposition might have changed his arrangements for that particular day. A delay of a few days would have given him time to promulgate his policy, and we may reasonably infer from the address of the Executive Committee to his successor* that this would have averted the catastrophe. Russia will some day have a constitutional government. This is a "historic necessity." Other nations have obtained it at a less advanced stage of economic and intellectual development than Russia. The struggle for it has been going on since the insurrection of 1825; it may take another twenty-five or fifty years, yet it might have succeeded twenty years ago. The difference of fifty years is here plainly the result of a mere accident.

What is the inference? That actions of individuals may hasten or delay the course of events, and, as a corollary, that no actual event is "historically necessary." The conception of "necessity" relates only to an abstraction of our mind, not to any actual occurrence. So when we say that "public ownership of public utilities" is a "historical necessity," we simply predict that a number of federal and state laws and municipal ordinances will be enacted from time to time, each dealing specifically with some public utility. (They could not possibly be enacted all on the same day, even should they eventually come as a result of a "revolution," whatever one may understand by it.) It is only the common principle (an abstraction) embodied in these acts that is said to be "necessary," the particular act is not. Every such act is the work

*See George Kennan's "Siberia and the Exile System," Vol. II.

of individuals ; its passage will as a rule depend upon the action or inaction of a few individuals.

The generalizations are of the domain of Sociology ; Sociology is therefore all "law" and "necessity." The particular acts make up the contents of History, and as every particular act is the work of individuals, so we may say that "men make History." A proper understanding of the laws of social development will enable the individual to direct his energy along the line of least resistance, or "to do in Rome as Romans do," as my friend Hennessey says. On the contrary, a misconception of the tendencies of social evolution may result in a Don-Quixotic policy, whose effect will be the reverse of that expected.

MARXIST.

Semi-Annual Report of the National Committee of the Socialist Party.

St. Louis, Mo., September 12, 1902.

To the Members of the Socialist Party.

Comrades: Your National Committee, in submitting its semi-annual report, deems it wise to confine itself to a statement of the difficulties confronting the party in order that the membership, being possessed of the facts, may take appropriate action.

While Socialist sentiment has increased throughout the country with marked rapidity, and while many very gratifying changes have taken place in our movement, we must in all candor say that the party organization has not been equal to the opportunities presented thereby. Since the last national convention the movement has been divided into as many parties as there are States, each directed by a state committee proceeding in its own weak fashion and according to its own conception of principles and tactics, with the result that the Socialist party to-day is no stronger than the strongest state organization affiliated. Instead of being a united party, we are fast becoming a mere "federation of Socialist Parties," each of these parties having its territorial limits and jealously guarding against any encroachment upon its domain.

Such a condition has led to endless confusion and needless waste of energy and funds.

Each state committee is bearing the burden of nursing an infant Socialist Party, and thus doing in each state what the party did on a national scale many years ago. Consequently, regardless of their good intentions, they are unable to properly meet their obligations to the National Organization.

In matters of organization and propaganda the desire of most state committees to till their own field makes us appear as an army of truck farmers instead of the "bonanza" farmers we might be were our operations conducted on a national scale. The most serious danger lies in questions of principles and tactics. The practical independence of the state organizations from the party as a whole makes it possible for young and inexperienced state committees to place the party in many painful and contradictory situations.

We recommend a careful study of the situation by all comrades, and set forth below some of the facts which lead us to the opinions herein expressed.

Financial.

At this time Illinois, Oklahoma and Wisconsin are in arrears for July and August; Nebraska and New York for June, July and

August; and Kansas and North Dakota since March. The National Constitution makes it mandatory upon state committees to pay national dues monthly, but the national Committee has no power to enforce this provision, which the state committees for the most part have not lived up to.

In Kansas, the dues system having been abolished, the state committee collects no dues from the comrades and pays no dues to the National Organization.

Thus, although its fixed expenses are increasing in proportion to the growth of the movement, the fluctuating revenues of the National Organization cause serious embarrassment at all times.

Methods of State Committees.

The National Constitution requires the state committees to make semi-annual reports, but the National Committee has no power to enforce this provision, which is not being observed. The absence of reports from state committees leaves the National Committee in the dark about conditions in the states.

In remitting national dues, the state committees, as a rule, do not state what locals have paid, nor on what month the dues apply, nor the number of members paid for by each local.

As a consequence, the National Secretary is unable to determine whether the states are forwarding their full quota of national dues.

It has been impossible since the Unity Convention to determine the number of locals and membership of the party in the United States, in the absence of reports by the state committees. This condition of affairs is attended with many dangers. Should a State Secretary for any reason be absent from his post, it is possible that neither the state or national organizations would know the names and locations of locals in the state. One instance of this kind occurred recently in Nebraska. The state committee of Wisconsin has refused a list of its locals up to the present time. Were this example generally followed we could not reach the membership in any national emergency.

Propaganda.

In order to meet the requirements of the movement for widespread propaganda, the National Committee started the Labor Lecture Bureau. That it is the most economic and far-reaching system of propaganda ever inaugurated in the Socialist movement is proven by requests for speakers from trade unions and party organizations in every state and territory, but the operations of this Lecture Bureau cannot be extended under existing conditions. National dues being diverted or withheld by state committees, the National Committee is helpless to furnish a national system of agitation. The locals, being thrown on their own re-

sources, are obliged to pay extravagantly for individual propaganda. The amount of money spent in planless propaganda in one month, by state committees and locals, would enable the National Committee to maintain a corps of clear and able speakers for one year, under the systematic and economic method of the Labor Lecture Bureau, with the added advantage of reaching into the trade union movement.

Agitation as at present conducted is sectional, being confined to the territory which can pay high prices for speakers.

A proper Socialist agitation is one that reaches into every section of the country, and regulates the cost with consideration for the scant funds of the proletarian organizations.

Party Organization.

The National Constitution gives the state committees sole control of all matters pertaining to organization within the respective states, and as a result a division of energy has been created, depriving the National Organization of the national co-operation necessary to send organizers into unorganized states.

The work of organization as conducted exclusively by state committees has in some instances been totally neglected, in others it languishes or is being conducted spasmodically, while in no instance have the results reached the degree of efficiency and stability that will in the end only be achieved by national co-operative effort.

The whole work of organization is segregated, sectional and at cross purposes.

Under the present system the state committees cannot insure permanency of employment to comrades most highly qualified as organizers, to induce them to undertake the work of the party.

Tactics and Principles.

The separation of the party into state organizations, each being supreme in its own state, holds forth a prospect of political advantage, very tempting to certain men. As a result, there have been factional fights in five states. Under the operation of the National Constitution, the National Committee cannot interfere to prevent or settle such troubles before they reach a serious stage, but must wait until there is a split in the state.

Such a struggle is now in progress in Nebraska. The fact that organizations in new states consist of elements inexperienced in the philosophy and tactics of the international Socialist movement naturally leads to political expressions, platforms and party tactics which conflict with Socialist principles and practices, and which are essentially middle class.

The factional fight in Utah was largely caused by such con-

ditions, and the National Committee could not interfere until there was a split and rival state committees to deal with.

The independent tendencies of the state organizations find expression in different tactics by different states on questions of national policy, so that while the National Committee may be attempting to rally the comrades of the country on a certain line of action, conflicting policies may be urged by one or more state committees. This confusion in organization and in tactics is well illustrated at this time by many of our comrades who seem to think that Socialist principles are justification for applauding a division on Socialist lines between the economic organizations of the working class.

While the Socialist party in national convention has solemnly pledged itself to the unification of the trade unions, yet a contrary policy has been set up in the West by comrades acting in a dual capacity as organizers of the American Labor Union and the Socialist party, thus misrepresenting the attitude of our party and compromising it in their attempts to build up a rival organization to the American Federation of Labor.

Conclusions.

The expense of holding the National Committee meeting in January last amounted to almost \$700. As there are now twice as many organized states as were then represented, the next meeting would cost about \$1,500.

The National Organization has not a cent toward meeting this expense, and if same is deducted as before by the states represented from funds due the National Committee, it will cause a recurrence of existing embarrassment, which not alone deprives the National Committee of sufficient funds for current expenses, but subjects us to the mortification of pleading constant bankruptcy to creditors of former national committees and humiliates your Local Quorum, which must henceforth decline to endure this condition. Furthermore, we do not believe that a meeting of the National Committee would suffice to thoroughly and decisively solve the problems herein presented; it would not bring about the general degree of understanding required between the comrades upon party policy and tactics.

The indefinite continuance of the present laxity of organization and confusion in methods so threatens the stability of our party that, no other means being sufficient to meet the emergency, we suggest to the consideration of the comrades such constitutional steps as may be necessary for holding a national convention of the Socialist party.

Meanwhile the conditions at present existing can be partially alleviated if the comrades in the delinquent states will hold their

respective state committees accountable in their dealings with the National Organization.

Fraternally,

G. A. Hoehn,

M. Ballard Dunn,

Wm. Brandt,

L. E. Hillebrand,

E. Val. Putnam,

Local Quorum.

A Correction.

Van Buren, Ark., Aug. 25, 1902.

A. M. Simons, Editor International Socialist Review.

My Dear Comrade: The Cincinnati Enquirer, of the edition of August 22d, publishes a scare-head article anent my so-called resignation from the Catholic priesthood and asserts that "the reason assigned for his withdrawal from the ministry and communion of the Catholic Church, Father Hagerty states, is the church's stand against Socialism and the incompatibility of her teachings with the doctrines of his economic creed." I have never made such a statement. While it is true that I have withdrawn from the technical work of the ministry, the withdrawal implies no derogation of my sacerdotal character. I am as much a priest to-day as I ever was. I have not separated myself from the communion of the Catholic Church; and I hold myself as much a member thereof as the Pope himself.

The enemies of Socialism will stop at nothing to discredit its mission. The political bigot seeks always some prejudice or pretext of religion to warrant his attack upon the adversaries of his party; and the lines of Boileau need no new rendition for our day:

*"Qui m'èprise Cotin n'estime point son roi,
Et n'a selon Cotin, ni Dieu, ni foi, ni loi."*

I have no economic creed. A creed supposes faith; and faith is the receiving of doctrine upon authority. Knowledge, on the contrary, is the direct recognition of truth by the intellect. One may have a religious belief, but not an economic creed. I do not believe in any economic creed, but I know the definite philosophy of Socialism. It is the utmost absurdity to speak of the incompatibility of Catholicism and Socialism. No one would dream of going into a meat market and asking for a Catholic beefsteak, a Methodist mutton chop, or a Presbyterian ham. Religion has no more to do with Socialism than it has with meat and bread. Socialism is an economic science, not a system of dogmatic beliefs. It is wholly beyond the scope of the church's mission to deal with questions of social economy, just as it is beyond the purpose of the Republican party to advance a new exegesis of the Davidic Psalms.

Bishops and priests exceed their authority when they use the influence of their position to oppose a movement whose highest purpose is the industrial liberation of the wage slaves of the world. According to the strictest interpretations of moral theology, Catholics are not bound to pay any attention to them in

such matters. The Pope's encyclicals on the question have no more authority than that which attaches to the opinions of any private theologian. The function of his office is confined strictly to matters of faith and morals. His judgment upon a canvas of Fra Angelico or a fragment of the Tel-el-Armana tablets is as much open to criticism as that of any other scholar.

It is to be regretted that a few bishops and priests, out of the abundance of their ignorance, have seen fit to attack the principles of Socialism, but it does not, therefore, follow that the doctrines of the church, as such, are in conflict with the truths of Socialism. The churchmen of the primitive days were genuine Socialists—men like St. John Chrysostom, who denounced the Capitalism of his day in the most acid words of the wondrous Greek in which he preached. With Whittier, rightly may

“I sigh for men as bold
As those bearded priests of old.

“Now too oft the priesthood wait
At the threshold of the state—
Waiting for the beck and nod
Of its power as law and God.”

Nevertheless, I thank God that such men as Father McGrady are gradually opening the eyes of Catholics to a sense of their rights in the field of industry and to a recognition of their individual freedom in all things outside of the fixed lines of dogma and revelation.

THOS. J. HAGERTY, A. M., S. T. B.

The Tenement Mother.



I LOVED my life while yet I was a child
Joy pulsed in heart and brain. The wind, the wild
Sweet bloom of spring, the summer rain, the year's
Bright afterglow—each spoke to eager ears
A message eloquent of beauty mild.
At times my poignancy of joy drew tears.

I loved my life when I was grown a maid,
When years of tribute to kind Nature paid
And many a poet's page that richly gleamed,
Had increase brought of joy. Then earth me-seemed
A garden full of guests whose mirth naught stayed.
Then saw I visions; yea, and fair dreams dreamed.

But now I love no more my life. Instead
Are loved these helpless lives that have been led
With care and patience since their days begun;
And much was needed as the long weeks ran.
They call me early from a half-slept bed
With fretful cries, as ailing infants can.

How can I love my life or joy—Ah, me!
In theirs, when all the long, hot days I see
Them droop their heads—like lily-stalks in drouth—
And paler grow, and piteous at the mouth,
By reason of the life that theirs must be
In these close rooms that search the torrid south.

Sometimes in dreams to love my life I dare;
For them I see a cool green wood and there,
All quiet in the shade, a tiny cot
With steep-pitched roof and cheerful chimney-pot
And porches wide, and comfort everywhere—
O God, of all Thy soil, for me no spot?

Methinks, indeed, I still could love my life
And revel in my children's happy strife,
Should such a home prove mine (not merely seem),
Dear to me there in every board and beam,
As babe that grows beneath my heart towards life.
This now my cherished vision, this my dream.

ISABEL N. WILDER.

EDITORIAL

A Discordant Note.

This is the last issue which will reach our readers before election. On the eve of war it is worth while to take a glance at the strength of our forces. It is hard to keep from superlatives in describing the progress of the socialist movement during the past year. There is scarcely a State that is not showing a growth far beyond what any one would have predicted who was present at the Indianapolis convention one year ago last July. Out on the Pacific coast, the State of Washington is roused as never before. The rapidly growing and ever improving Seattle Socialist is filled with reports of enthusiastic county conventions in localities never before invaded by socialism, while several active agitators are constantly working where hitherto none were known.

Oregon is moving almost if not quite as fast; while California seems ablaze throughout her entire length. So rapidly is socialism growing in that State that it is a poor week that does not turn out at least one new socialist paper from California. From San Francisco comes news that would indicate that the Union Labor party had already found its natural place in the ranks of the socialist movement. Los Angeles, with one of the most active and best edited papers in the country, will certainly be heard from when election returns are counted.

Idaho was an almost unknown territory to the socialist explorer of but a year ago. To-day the Idaho Socialist has just been incorporated with a capital stock of \$10,000 and promises immediate enlargement. The news columns of this paper indicate that few spots will remain uninfected by the socialist virus by election time. In Utah, whether because of, or in spite of, national interference, we have two socialist papers in practically the same locality and largely antagonistic. But both factions show such good sense and such an utter lack of the personal abuse that have so often marked socialist controversies in the past that we feel sure it will not be long until we shall see a solidly united socialist movement in this State. Meanwhile the activity which both are showing for the ticket which has been nominated promises well for the coming election.

When one comes to Colorado the enthusiasm begins to mount high. Capitalist politicians grant us from fifty to seventy thousand votes and the election of a large number of local officials, several members of the Legislature and, probably, a Congressman. Whether these hopes can

be fulfilled or not time alone can tell, but it is certain that the comrades at the base of the Rockies are putting up by far the strongest fight that has ever been made by any single State in the Union. They have done this, furthermore, without any assistance from the other States and, indeed, with something of opposition.

In Montana and the Dakotas socialism is springing up on every hand, even in localities apparently untouched by socialist propaganda. Perhaps the situation through this whole locality is better expressed by a recent report of Comrade Chase than by anything we could possibly say in the matter.

"The population of these States is made up of social rebels who have come from all parts of the country to the west in search for freedom from the oppression of capitalism in the east or in quest of fortune in the gold fields. They are, therefore, made up of freedom-loving, whole-souled people who are not tied down by bigotry and ignorance and made cowardly by fear of losing a six-dollar-a-week job. They are more free than is the worker of the east, and they see that the conditions under which the eastern mill and factory hand and mine worker labors is liable to overtake them and they are ready to fight it. The west will furnish the great impetus to the Socialist movement, and this in the near future. The western wealth producer will not allow himself to be subjected to the degrading and humiliating servitude of the eastern wage slave. He will strike a blow with the ballot, that will not only prevent his enslavement but one that will strike the shackles from the limbs of his eastern brethren."

The Missouri comrades have made great inroads upon the ranks of the pure and simple unions and are taking advantage of the nauseating hoodling in St. Louis politics to lead the laborers out of the general rottenness of capitalist politics into the socialist movement.

In Kansas and Nebraska we hear stories of State conventions with 300 delegates where 20 would have been considered a crowd a few years ago, and the promise is made of a rousing campaign in the near future.

Illinois has increased her number of Locals more than tenfold in the last year and will have three agitators steadily in the field from now until election, where there has never been an attempt to maintain more than one heretofore, while a number of volunteer speakers will be sent to different parts of the State as called upon. In several of the districts there is at least a fighting chance of the election of a man to the Legislature and the certainty of a largely increased vote.

Wisconsin has just held a State convention that was by far the largest ever known in her history and will maintain several organizers in the field. Indeed, the Wisconsin comrades are claiming that they will lead the procession of the States in Socialist votes this fall.

Indiana is another State in which Socialism is penetrating into the uttermost corner. In Evansville, for example, the trades unions are almost unanimous for Socialism. Several local Socialist papers have already been started or are in preparation in different towns, numerous organizers have been working through the State, and the number of Locals is growing with great rapidity. Literature is being distributed in large quantities and unless signs fail, this State will be a surprise

to many who have not been watching the quiet though energetic campaign which has been carried on by the Socialists of that State.

Ohio is another State where the work has been continuous, systematic and extensive, reaching into new fields and laying the foundations for a strong movement in the future.

Pennsylvania, like Colorado, gives occasion for the most extravagant hopes. It is now thoroughly recognized that the great coal strike has been the mightiest propaganda movement for Socialism that this or any other country has ever seen. Throughout the length and breadth of the Keystone State the laborers are awakening in rebellion. Comrade Warde of Erie is practically certain of election to the Legislature, where he will find Socialist colleagues from Schuylkill, Wilkesbarre and Luzerne. A quotation from a recent report of the Pennsylvania Secretary will give an idea of the way things are moving there:

"The straits to which the old parties are put by our agitation is shown by their begging Socialists to vote at their primaries. One paper says: 'A primary vote is not governed by the vote a man intends to cast at the next election. Republicans who voted the party ticket last fall and who have lately affiliated themselves with the Socialist party, cannot be deprived of the right to vote on Saturday.' The Socialists stayed away from the polls just the same and to-day a Republican cannot be found in that town that will tell how many votes were cast by his party.

"There is a story that was told Governor Stone of this State when interested persons were trying to get him to settle the strike. 'In Schuylkill County to-day,' said Mr. Wilhelm, 'the Socialist party has put a full ticket in the field. When the referendum was submitted to the Socialist organizations on a vote for a candidate for the State Senate to succeed Senator Higgins, one candidate received 1,700 votes and the other 1,600, making 2,300 votes they have in their 27 organizations, and if this strike keeps on they will have 127 organizations on election day. The head of the organization is an intelligent man, a client of mine, with a son at Dickinson College, and he is the last man I thought to see lead a band of Socialists.' "

The New York Worker tells of 300,000 pieces of literature being ordered in one week for a campaign in that State and a half-dozen speakers are carrying the good news into ever new districts.

Little New Jersey has arranged to put three speakers into the field continuously from now until election. This should suffice to reach most of the voters in that State.

Down in Massachusetts it seems probable that Comrades Carey and McCartney will, in the future, not find themselves standing alone in their opposition to the capitalist parties, as there is a promise that other Socialists will be sent to join them in the Legislature. A straw that shows how things are blowing in that State is furnished by the action of the Springfield Central Labor Union, which has recently responded to the call of the Milwaukee Trades Council for a new Labor Party by saying that the Socialist Party filled the bill and no new party was required. Old Faneuil Hall very recently was given a sensation which must have reminded it of the good old times of 1776. A "Conciliation" meeting had been called to show the common interests of capital and

labor in the coal mines. Things went very smoothly until Comrades Carey and McCartney got onto the floor, when the meeting stampeded for Socialism and indorsed a Socialist resolution almost unanimously.

"Oh, have you heard the news from Maine? How it went"—100 per cent gained for the Socialist Party. We are now an official party in this State and only two campaigns gone by.

While we write this news comes that the last region to resist Socialism has at last been invaded. The solid South, the black belt, has given way before the advance of the social revolution. Alabama is now in the field with a full State ticket, has her local agitation leaflets, and has arranged to make a full campaign.

Into the midst of this general chorus of exultation and encouraging voices comes a discordant note in the shape of the "Semi-annual Report of the National Executive Committee," so-called, which is published elsewhere in this number. We say "so-called" advisedly, for while the report bears this high-sounding title it carries only the names of the five St. Louis comrades who constitute the "Local Quorum," something quite different from the N. E. C., and there is no reason to believe that the latter ever lent their sanction to such a document.

The first impression this "Report" makes is one of amazement at its astounding impudence, and the insulting language used toward the party membership by those who are but party employees. At a time when a dozen State committees are doing more each week than the national officials have done since their election, it sounds rather strange to hear this local quorum talking of "each . . . State Committee proceeding in its own weak fashion." In the same way such phrases as "young and inexperienced State committees" comes with ill-grace from a body of men, a majority of whom have been in party work a much shorter time than the State committees criticised. Neither have we yet heard that any of these State committees have placed the party in any situation one-half as "painful and contradictory" as that in which the Local Quorum has placed the whole party by its meddling and officious resolution in the matter of the American Labor Union.

In this connection a word of explanation may be necessary as to our attitude on the question of the A. L. U., especially as it has been claimed that the editorial which appeared in the August number of this Review inspired the resolutions. We still believe that had the Western Federation of Miners made some effort at conciliation, which efforts we are now certain would have been rejected, it would have strengthened their subsequent position. Neither do we see that their declaration for Socialism was in any way intimately connected with their announced determination to invade the East and establish rival unions to the A. F. L. But neither of these positions would justify us individually in maintaining an attitude of hostility to the A. L. U. in favor of the A. F. of L., and there was nothing whatever in the editorial mentioned which gives ground for the statement that our attitude was one of hostility toward the A. L. U. But the main point in this connection is that the N. E. C., and still less the Local Quorum had no right to make any opinion, whether of this Review or any other individual or set of individuals, the "official" position of the party.

The whole attitude of the Local Quorum on this matter has been di-

rected toward giving the impression that the Indianapolis convention organized, not a Socialist party, but an annex to the A. F. of L. The question of the proper attitude toward the western comrades (who, whatever else may be said of them, are doing tenfold the Socialist propaganda done by the national headquarters) is something upon which the Socialist party has taken no stand whatever, and the attempt to curry favor with the reactionary, not say fakir, element in the A. F. of L. by claims to the contrary is wholly unjustified, to say the least. The Socialist party has not yet spoken on that subject, and the five St. Louis Socialists who pretend to speak in the name of that party are making themselves as ridiculous as the original "Three Tailors of Tooley Street."

The main whine of the "Report" is on the non-payment of dues, always a tender subject with official bodies. But the list of delinquent States shows that Illinois and Wisconsin, who have always stood for State autonomy, are less delinquent than those strenuous advocates of centralization,—New York and Nebraska.

The statement that "the amount of money spent in planless propaganda in one month by State committees and locals would enable the National Committee" to perform such wonders, is not only insulting to the State committees, but decidedly ridiculous in view of the little that the national officers have accomplished with the something over \$3,500 which they have had during the last six months. They have used the money which they have had in multiplying office expenses beyond all sense, and what little has been spent for propaganda has been largely employed in sending organizers into States already organized, sometimes against the protest of State committees, whose much better prepared plans were thereby disarranged, while suspicion and misunderstanding were aroused in local movements and disorganization spread among the already organized. That more harm was not actually accomplished was due to the fact that the comrades who were sent out as organizers were infinitely more tactful and intelligent than those who sent them.

The statement that "certain men" are seeking "political advantage" through State autonomy is a cowardly libel worthy of a Hickey or a Keep that should be at once proven or apologized for and withdrawn. Otherwise it will be easy for some one to retort that centralization may offer "political advantages" to "certain officials," a charge which, we believe, would be equally false and contemptible, but more excusable after the issuance of this circular.

The reference to local factional fights carries no weight unless accompanied by evidence that national interference has been helpful in the States where attempted, something which we believe to be hardly susceptible of proof. Indeed, there is every reason to believe from the attitude and language of the present circular that had the party not very wisely curbed the power of the Local Quorum in the direction of State interference, we would now have, not even a "federation of Socialist parties," but a number of wholly unconnected parties.

The "Conclusion" forms a fitting climax to the whole circular. After scolding, abusing and snarling at the party membership they have the impudence to suggest that that membership be punished by being

forced to hold a convention to give these same men more power,—a proceeding that would cost not less than \$25,000 and occupy the attention of the entire party for several months to the complete exclusion of the real business of propaganda and organization. Permit us to suggest that there are at least two other alternatives. The first and best is for the Local Quorum to submit to the will of the convention electing them, curb their exalted opinions of their own importance and confine themselves to the work for which they were elected,—that of organizing the unorganized territory and acting as a means of communication between the party organizations. If this is impossible and they really feel they “must decline to endure this condition” any longer then their resignations are in order as a much simpler and easier solution of the difficulty than the proposed convention.

These criticisms and conclusions may seem harsh, but they are mild compared with the criticisms and conclusions contained in the Report. Moreover, if anyone feels that we have been unjust, the columns of this Review are open to any member of the Local Quorum or any of their defenders, who may object to the positions here taken. We regret that our national officers have seen fit to precipitate such discussion in the midst of a campaign, but if any evil results to the cause of Socialism, it is upon them that the odium must rest. We feel sure, however, that the cause of Socialism is now too strong in this country to be greatly affected by any such a “palace revolution,” and that the membership will be able to discuss and dispose of the matter without any injurious friction.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Germany.

The report of the National Committee of the German Social Democratic Party to the national convention in Muenchen, held September 14th, shows that the agrarian tariff has been one of the best means of agitation which the party has ever had. The documents protesting against the tariff bore no less than 3,431,784 signatures. A recent dispatch of the Associated Press supplements this with the report that a speaker at the convention expected the party to receive three million Socialist votes and 100 seats at the next Reichstag's election. The party has carried on a tremendous agitation, in spite of the officious interference of the police, which seems to be a source of much fun to the comrades, judging by their good-natured and jocular comments on the helmeted guardians of the peace. In this connection, it is interesting to note what constitutes a legal cause for dissolving a Socialist meeting in Saxony: To discuss social conditions in a loud voice; if the policeman attending the meeting has cold feet; if the speaker mentions the devil; if the audience applauds a speaker who is called to order; if the policeman thinks the meeting lasts too long. This explains why Saxony has the greatest number of Socialists in municipal councils. In Leipzig, the police forbade any meetings, in which tickets were sold and plays enacted, shortly before the annual picnic of the Socialists was due. The next number of the party organ calmly announced, that the committee in charge had prepared a holiday number for the picnic and advised the comrades to buy it as soon as possible, so that the police department would "not regard the buying of the holiday number as a circumvention of its decree." The holiday number was such a howling success that the police department canceled its decree, and the laughing Socialists had the pleasure of increasing their funds still more by selling tickets at the gate.

A demand for a thorough reform of the election laws has been placed on the minutes of the legislatures, and although no positive results have been obtained, the sentiment in favor of this reform is widespread and cannot be long resisted by the bourgeois parties.

The party press is now composed of one central organ, "Vorwaerts," one scientific review, "Neue Zeit," 54 dailies, 10 appearing thrice a week, 4 twice a week, 7 weeklies, one fortnightly, 2 monthlies, 2 fortnightly satirical papers, 2 weekly illustrated family papers, and one

fortnightly paper, "Gleichheit," for proletarian women. The trade union press consists of one appearing thrice a week, 32 weeklies, 2 thrice a month, 21 twice a month, and 11 monthlies.

The total income of "Vorwaerts" amounted to 679,380.80 mark, the total expense to 618,778.95, leaving a balance of 60,601.85 mark in the treasury. The Vorwaerts-Buchhandlung did business to the amount of 193,754 mark and paid 15,000 mark into the party treasury, which has a surplus of 15,035.56 mark.

The number of female "Vertrauenspersonen" (trustees), has doubled since 1901 and is now 50. The locals of the three Hamburg election districts have the highest number of female comrades, 902. In Saxony, the twelfth and thirteenth election districts have 550 organized women, other Saxon districts have 194 and 180. The income of "Gleichheit" during the last year was 2,900.29 mark, the expense 2,195.55 mark, leaving a favorable balance of 704.74 mark.

The convention was opened by comrade Singer who welcomed the foreign delegates. Austria had sent comrades Sellger, Adler, Pernerstorfer, Seitz, Abram, Zelger, Filger-Haas, Nemec, and the female comrades Popp, Pohl and Schlesinger. England was represented by comrade Askew, of the S. D. F., Belgium and France by comrade Vandervelde, Italy by comrade Lerda, Switzerland by comrade Mueller. The foreign delegates made short speeches in their own languages. Numerous telegrams from the Socialist parties of other countries reached the desk of the chairman. Ninety-one different resolutions from all parts of the empire were presented to the convention. The female comrades, represented by 25 delegates, deliberated in separate convention.

The proceedings were carried through without a hitch. The character of the party as a champion of the working class and of a higher order of human society was clearly expressed in Bebel's speech on the coming Reichstag's elections. It was the great challenge to the capitalist parties for 1903. It was the declaration of war against the enemies of the working class who increase the price of the necessities of life to producers, against the exploiters of labor power, against the henchmen of capitalist justice, against the capitalist state and the nobility and clericalism that uphold it, against militarism and colonial conquests, against all wrong and oppression. It clearly emphasized, in the words of "Vorwaerts" that "wherever the representatives of Socialism gather there is the nation's true civilization and freedom."

England.

The British trade unions held their annual convention in London on September 6th. While the convention did not make any radical departure from the old policy, still the dawn of light is visible in the resolutions adopted. A resolution denouncing the South African war was adopted with 591,000 against 314,000 votes. The convention appointed a parliamentary committee and instructed it to confer with all labor bodies that are in favor of independent political action. The

Socialists even succeeded in passing a resolution demanding the collective ownership of the means of production and exchange. How little such resolutions mean without a recognition of the class struggle, we have seen in the American Knights of Labor. Also the convention did not accept the invitation of the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels to send delegates to the International Congress in 1903. It was recognized, that the Taff-Vale decision threatened the very existence of the trade unions, and a demand was made for new legislation defining the status of the unions. New Zealand arbitration was defeated by a vote of 961,000 against 303,000. Sam Woods was re-elected secretary by a majority of 823,000. A great demonstration was made in Hyde Park, where Shackleton, Keir Hardie and John Burns delivered radical speeches. The English trade unions, like the man who squirms around the dentist's office before he has his tooth pulled, take a long time before they accept the inevitable—the Socialist platform.

Italy.

The National Convention of the Italian Socialist Party, held in Imola on September 6th to 8th, settled the vexing question of the two tendencies in a very amicable manner by declaring them a "division of labor which does not disturb the unity of the party." The party has splendidly developed and consists now of 1,336 locals with 51,415 members in Italy and 49 locals with 1,703 members in France, England, Germany, and Switzerland. In 1895, the party had only 442 locals with 19,121 members. The vote on the question of tactics showed plainly that the revolutionary wing is gaining ground. Comrade Ferri offered the following resolution which was defeated with 456 against 279 votes:

Whereas, The action of the Socialist Party must be determined by its revolutionary character; every reform must be gained by the working class itself, and must be co- and subordinated to the general purpose, viz., the political and economic transformation of the present order of society, which must be carried through by the proletariat organized as a class party; and whereas, the unity of the Party is not endangered by the simultaneous existence of two tendencies and tactics;

Resolved, That the Socialist Party must pursue its political and economic aims independently and separately from any other class, sect, or political party.

The following resolution, introduced by comrade Bonomi, was adopted, the division of the house being the same:

Whereas, all reforms that ameliorate the economic, political and moral conditions of the proletariat, or that obstruct capitalist exploitation, operate effectively toward the attainment of the aim of the social revolution, collectivism;

The convention declares that this conception is incompatible with the existence of two distinct tendencies based on substantial differences and affirms that the action of the party is reformatory because

revolutionary and revolutionary because reformatory, or that the action of the party is simply Socialist;

The convention recognizes the fundamental law of the variety of forces that serve a uniform aim and confirms, for eventual alliances with popular parties, the tactics adopted by the convention of Rome for the autonomy of the sections, with such restraints as local or provincial conventions may impose for the purpose of preventing the manifestation of evident aberrations from Socialism;

The convention, firm in the democratic conception that the political representation must reflect as directly as possible the sovereignty of the masses and disappear, so to say, in an intimate and direct contact between representatives and represented, declares that the Socialist group in parliament is autonomous in its actions, but must keep in continual touch with the mind and will of the great mass of proletarians, toward whom the political organizations of the party have the plain duty to stimulate and keep awake the spirit of criticism, of control by frequent meetings and unceasing propaganda, of organization and of political education;

And recognizing that, however deplorable the vacillating and often unliberal attitude of the present Cabinet may be, the support given to it by our party succeeded in safeguarding the development of proletarian organization against a possible relapse into reactionary attacks, the convention approves of the work of the Socialist group in Parliament and advises it to maintain the most absolute liberty of action in parliamentary questions against the government and the other parties, remembering that all coalitions with other than proletarian parties must necessarily be only transitory expedients, and must be closed for the purpose of palpable advantages to the party, and with the consciousness of their certain dissolution in the future.

The convention finally hopes that the reaffirmed unity of the party will signify the beginning of a new and more fertile era of Socialist propaganda and organization."

Both Ferri and Turati declared their satisfaction with the result in their closing speeches.

The representatives of the party in parliament remain independent in their decisions, but it was emphasized that they must be in touch with the views and wishes of the great mass of the proletariat. A street parade of five thousand Socialists of both sexes closed the convention.

Norway.

The Norwegian Socialists held their national convention on August 22-25. The party has made good progress during the last year.

From July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, 76 locals joined the party, which now has 211 locals with about 12,000 members. Agitation meetings were held in 150 towns. The Socialist Young People's clubs have been a great assistance to the party. Votes increased considerably, but in consequence of lack of employment a great number lost their franchise, in Christiania alone over 4,000 men since 1900. Women in the

cities took part in the elections up to 48 per cent, in the country only 9.4 per cent. A collection for the party organ yielded 2,083.22 kroner. "Ny Tid," the organ of the Trondhjem comrades, is to become a daily. The following resolution as to tactics was adopted: Alliances with other political parties are only admissible on condition of a satisfactory allotment of candidates to the Socialist party, but under no condition must the program be violated. No local has the right to form an alliance without the consent of the central committee of the party.

France.

The national convention of the Parti Socialiste de France (Unite Revolutionnaire) was held in Commeny (Allier) on September 26th to 28th. The different points discussed were: Reports of the Central Committee; report of the representatives in the chamber; report of the federations; examination of the elections of 1902 and their consequences; organization of the party; the international congress in 1903; election of executive committees. Further details will be given next month.

The 20th national convention of the Parti Ouvrier Francais was held on September 21st and following days. The program was similar to that mentioned above. Detailed news has not yet reached us.

Switzerland.

The capitalist judges had declared the recent election in Ausser-siehl (Zurich), in which the Socialists won a great victory, null and void. A re-election became necessary on September 1st. In the previous election, 9,271 voters went to the polls. This time 9,571 came. The highest number of Socialist votes in the previous election was 5,932, the lowest 4,362. The new election brought us from 6,318 to 5,024 votes. The Socialists gained almost twice as many seats as the bourgeois parties. In Bern, comrade Langhans was elected president of the Court with 1,598 votes against 1,468 of all bourgeois parties.

Holland.

The election in the ninth district in Amsterdam for parliament resulted in a great victory for comrade Troelstra. At the general elections in 1901, only 877 Socialist votes were cast. This time the Socialist vote was 2,050. In 1901 the liberals received 29 per cent of the vote, but now only 15; the clericals in 1901 had 34 per cent, now only 30; the radicals maintained their 18 per cent; but the percentage of the Socialists rose from 19 to 37 per cent in a single year.

Japan.

Comrade T. Sawa was elected to the Diet in the recent general election. Several other Socialists polled a high vote. The party is growing marvelously.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

From all reports from different parts of the country the Socialist party is making steady headway and will poll an increased vote in every State in the Union next month—in fact, there is little doubt but the gain will be fully a hundred per cent over the Presidential election in 1900. So far the comparatively unorganized States of Oregon, on the Pacific coast, and Maine, on the Atlantic coast, have more than doubled their vote, compared to two years ago. In the States in which more propaganda has been made the result will probably be surprising, especially in Pennsylvania, Colorado and other States both east and west. An evidence of growing strength is the increase of Socialist party papers, hardly a week going by that one or more do not start, while new speakers are mounting the “soap-box” every day. Another important sign is the pitiful attempt that is being made by the old-party politicians to dig up some “issue” to raise a noise and befuddle the minds of workingmen. The politicians hardly know whether the issue this year is the tariff, the gold ring, imperialism, three-cent fare, trusts or free coinage of wliener wurst. The Democracy is nearing another split between the conservative Cleveland-Hill-Gorman crowd and the Bryan-Johnson radicals, so-called, and Roosevelt’s demands that the trusts be “restrained” has started a drawing of lines between the fossils and the strenuous reactionists in that party. Meanwhile the minority organizations are crumbling before the forward march of the young giant, the Socialist party. One hardly hears anything about the Prohibition party, the People’s party is dead in all but Texas and a few other States, where a desperate effort is being made to keep up the appearance of being alive; the Union Reform party has formally disbanded and quit the field, and the crazy old deleonized Socialist Labor party is dragging its remaining foot in the political grave, about fifty of its remaining active workers having resigned or been suspended or expelled for “treason to the working class,” and there is now nobody left but Mr. De Leon and a man named Corregan and a few obscure dues-payers. With the driftwood of reform and fanaticism out of the way, nothing on earth can prevent an enormous popular revolt against capitalism and its parties. Watch the returns next month.

National Organizer John C. Chase, of the Socialist party, writes enthusiastically of the growing sentiment in favor of Socialism among the farmers of Montana, Idaho, the Dakotas and other western States. Chase says the farmers are either workers, or their sons, who left the capitalistic-conquered industrial centers of the East, hoping to escape the modern slave-driver, but the villain still pursues them and they

are as deeply in the mud as we in the shops and factories are in the mire. Chase corroborates the views of A. M. Simons, who has made a special study of the agricultural conditions of this country, and points out that the clod-hopper is up against the same stone wall of economic facts that the wage-worker of the city is, viz.; labor-saving machinery and trustified capital. The People's party having been scuttled by Bryan and the "new" Democracy, which in turn has again gone into the control of the gold bugs, the farmers who are not capitalistic in instinct should line up with the Socialist party and aid Simons to circulate literature that will put their class on the right track. Get busy, Rube!

The colossal combinations that have been formed in the last four or five years are entering the final stage of capitalism's evolution rapidly enough. The press of the country, and especially New York, the fountain-head of great capitalism, is marveling at the acquired power of Morgan. "The whole world," says the daily press, "looks to an unpretentious office at No. 23 Wall street which bears the sign 'J. P. Morgan & Co.,' for its cue whenever any transaction involving millions—whether it be a war or a coal strike, an amalgamation of steamship and railroad lines, or the financing of a bankrupt kingdom—is up for discussion." Our informants go on to say: "The total capital which J. P. Morgan & Co. controls and guards figures up **NEARLY SIX BILLIONS AND A HALF OF DOLLARS**, or, to be absolutely accurate, \$6,448,500,000. Besides this vast sum other great accumulations look small. The gold coin and gold certificates in the United States Treasury only amount to about \$550,000,000, and yet this is unprecedented. All the gold coined and uncoined in the whole world is estimated at \$4,841,000,000. The total number of human beings in the world is estimated at 1,320,000,000. The public debt of the United States on June 30, 1900, was \$1,107,711,257. The entire revenue of the forty-three principal nations of the world for the year 1900 was \$3,781,392,563. The properties in which J. P. Morgan & Co. are interested, either through control, through membership on their boards, through financing them, or by reason of acting as their fiscal agents, are, with their capitalization, as follows, according to lists furnished by the financial agencies: Ships, Atlantic Steamship Company, \$170,000,000; railroads of all kinds, seventeen, \$3,088,500,000; industrials, thirteen, \$2,022,250,000; banks and trust companies, seven, \$187,000,000; miscellaneous, sixty-seven, \$990,750,000." When it is considered that this tremendous revolution has taken place in the short space of five or six years—when one man controls by a billion more than all the capital invested in manufacturing—what will be the condition five years hence? Superficial thinkers sometimes declare in a pessimistic tone that "Socialism is all right, but it won't come in my time." Won't it? Well, maybe not, if all the old fogies sit still and allow one man to gain control of the nation and run it to suit himself—not only sit still, but actually assist him with their votes by throwing them away to the old parties, which are dominated by Morgan and his class. How do you like the outlook? Answer at the ballot-box next month.

During the past month a number of significant straws have blown across the economic field that are quite portentous. For weeks money

was "tight" in stock gambling circles. Bank statements were devoured greedily and heavy loans were negotiated. Money was brought to Wall street from Chicago and the extreme West, and ships were held up on the high seas and relieved of their treasure to relieve a "stringency" that had made itself manifest in the heart of capitalism. You see, it is this way: A Cabinet member in Washington explains to a correspondent of a Chicago daily that a blow at the trusts will hit the banks of New York, Chicago and the Western cities, and seriously injure the Western farmers. Therefore, says this Cabinet member, tariff revision will prove disastrous. He explains how this is by stating that the farmers have their money in their local banks; these country banks have their money in larger cities, like Omaha, Minneapolis, Kansas City, etc.; and that these banks have their reserves in the banks of Chicago. The banks of Chicago have their money in New York. So we have a string of banks, the smaller ones leaning on the larger for support. He continues: "In New York you will find that both deposits and loans have been enormous. The money is not in the banks. There are only six national banks in New York that have not been below their legal reserves since Jan. 1. You want to know where this money is? Well, \$450,000,000 is loaned by national banks on the bonds of industrial corporations. These corporations issued bonds instead of stocks because the national banks can take the former and can't the latter. Intrinsically they are not better than stocks. Here you see where \$450,000,000 of the country's surplus stands against a lot of undigested, promotion-produced securities. The trust companies have put out millions more in the same way. That is where we stand. It is all right so long as it is all right. But I don't want to see anything happen. I don't want to see these industrials begin to topple over, to fall against one another and come down in a heap like children's play-blocks. And this is one reason why I am opposed to a tariff revision agitation that might start things going the wrong way." Another Washington correspondent says the "tip" has gone out that "a financial and industrial panic is expected to be on about next March." What will that mean? Nothing much—except that those Western farmers can whistle for their money while they are holding the bag, many of the trusts will be "reorganized" into the hands of Morgan and Rockefeller and the small stockholders will be squeezed out like water from a sponge; the middle class capitalists will pour their little hoardings into a rat-hole and probably find the "red flag" of the Sheriff in front of their doors; and the labor class, well, the labor class that has always meddled in the fight between the great capitalists and the small ones, will suffer all the pangs of hunger and privation again, to which it is more or less accustomed. Natural causes are still at work, and, whether the next "squeeze" comes next March or a year later, it is coming. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," and if American capitalism has not gone stark crazy, then the laws of evolution are out of joint. This is an opportune time to scatter Socialist party literature knee deep.

The general labor situation is satisfactory at present. All of the national unions are growing in membership and increasing their financial resources. While prices of necessities are advancing, the organized

workers are struggling with considerable success, especially in the clothing industry, to organize and control their industries. "Keep even" means to keep the workers as they are, without change. There are no great strikes in progress at present in the clothing trade. In West Virginia, however, the "hunger for bread" of the miners is still a thing to be reckoned with. The workers there have been so badly off that they have given up their strikes and returned to the mines at the lowest terms. In Pennsylvania the workers fight and the coal owners are not at all likely to make any effort to give the laborers any more than they can get for up to the neck of their own backs. The workers and the employers are in the struggle. If the coal owners do not give the A. F. of L. men in New Orleans their money, it is quite likely that an agreement will be made that will enable them to continue the struggle all winter. Shortage of coal has been noticed on the coal fields, but as they have millions of tons of them they pretend that they do not mind it. Last year Morgan drove the iron and steel workers to the number of 10,000 back to work at the terms he dictated; this year he is attempting to subjugate 170,000 miners, and next year, it is rumored, he may test his strength against close to a million railway employees, as probably by that time he will have so arranged the big systems that he will be complete dictator. The crisis is drawing nearer each day, and the necessity of striking at the nail-box is becoming plainer—so plain that even the most stupid can see it.

Another great combination is announced—not the kind in which a few millions or hundreds of millions are in the game, but billions are to be amalgamated. It is stated that the Vanderbilts and the Pennsylvania railway interests have reached an agreement, and that over 3,000 miles of railroad property, capitalized at \$2,200,000,000, will be amalgamated. The combine will cover nearly all the territory between the Mississippi and the Atlantic coast and the Potomac and Canadian border. In a short time, it is stated, Morgan and his crowd will be brought into the community and then there is no knowing what the combine will control. The meat is also about to join the procession of fat men with half a billion of capital, to control everything from ranches to retail stores in the cities, and to increase its capital gradually. The whole thing: "Socialism in our time" was laughed at two years ago. There isn't quite so much hilarity at present. He who laughs last laughs best.

BOOK REVIEWS

Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings. Helena Bond, with a biography by the editor, Helen Tufts. Printed at the Everett Press, Boston, Mass., 123 pages, uncut, paper label, \$1.00.

This book will prove a welcome addition to the library of every admirer of Whitman. While other subjects than Whitman's writings are discussed in the various essays contained in the book, all such subjects are treated from the Whitman standpoint.

The essay whose title is given to the book is an exposition of Whitman's ideas as to a future society. This position, like that of the author herself, as set forth in the accompanying biography, is decidedly indefinite. In this it is very like Whitman himself. Nevertheless, the current of thought runs parallel with the philosophy of Socialism. After all, one does not really expect a poet to write political economy, and perhaps it would be well for Socialists if they could sometimes get a glimpse of the broad sweep of things which Whitman expresses. The book is bound in restful, artistic style, which makes it pleasant to hold and look upon.


Perfecting the Earth. C. W. Wooldridge. Utopia Publishing Company. Cleveland, Ohio. Cloth, 326 pages, \$1.50.

This book is but one of a class of books now grown to large numbers which have appeared within the last few years, and mostly within the last few months, which seem to indicate the approach of a new "Utopianism" totally different from the old, wholly imaginative sort. It would seem as if the Socialist movement had now reached a point where the imminence of a great social change is generally recognized, since these latter day Utopians write as of a society immediately at hand. They deal in mathematical calculations, locate their ideal societies in well-known existing places. They coldly calculate the amount of labor necessary to transform things as they are now into things as they would have them.

Dr. Wooldridge sets the beginning of his Utopia in the year 1913, when a great unemployed problem (another proof of Comrade Wiltshire's prophetic ability) has come upon the country. A commanding general asks permission to transform his force from a military to an industrial army. This permission is granted in reckless disregard of the existence of any class struggle, and the army proceeds to transform large portions of the country into ideal communities. It is rather significant that the section selected by the author as most suitable for his ideal commonwealth is the arid land of the Southwest, since the

workers are attempting, with building, printing, clothing and while, of course, the unorganized no great strikes in progress. Virginia, thanks to the "men" and deputies, the workers have their struggle and return to Pennsylvania, the corrupt Quay every effort to drive the bar to this writing they have been the attempt. If the men can New Orleans next month, it is levied that will enable them. Immense losses have been inflicted millions behind them they go. Morgan drove the iron and back to work at the terms he jugate 150,000 miners, and strength against close to a that time he will have so complete dictator. The crisis is a city of striking at the ballot-box the most stupid can see it.

Another great combination of a few millions or hundreds of to be amalgamated. It is so in Pennsylvania railway interests have 3,000 miles of railroad property amalgamated. The combine the Mississippi and the Atlantic border. In a short time, it brought into the community combine will control. The men fat men with half a billion ranches to retail stores in the The shibboleth: "Socialism!" There isn't quite so much hill best.



present facts would seem to point to these localities as the future fields of the greatest governmental activity the world has ever known.

The reader will find numerous interesting scientific speculations, and on the whole the book is one which cannot fail to suggest many new lines of thought. It would seem that the author is largely cut off, in thought at least, from the great stream of Socialist thought of today, as the work makes no account of the existing social forces which are working for Socialism, in this respect being much more like the older Utopias.

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Frederick Engels. Translated from the German by Ernst Untermann. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, Standard Socialist Series, 217 pp. 50 cents.

One of the few Americans who has won a position among the thinkers in languages other than English is Lewis J. Morgan. His work on "Ancient Society" was the first basic analysis of the origins of many social institutions. This work has been persistently ignored and suppressed by the bourgeois scientists of this country. Now that it is practically out of print, there is double reason why this work by Frederick Engels, which was largely founded on that of Morgan, should be made accessible to English readers. It must not be thought, however, that Engels has simply summarized or popularized Morgan. He has done much more than this. He has added to Morgan's work the result of the researches of a large number of other writers in wholly different fields and has brought the work down to accord with almost the latest discoveries of modern anthropology and ethnology. The last revision of his work was made by Engels in June, 1891, and it is from this edition that the translation has been made.

This book has long been known as one of the great socialist classics and has been translated into almost every other language than English. It is in many senses a supplement to Marx's Capital in that it begins at the very origin of the things whose climax and latest developments are described in Capital. The first half of the book is given up to the discussion of the evolution of the human family. The continual changes in the marriage relation which have been brought about by changes in economic environment are set forth at length with a vast mass of evidence and information. It is shown how, prior to the coming of private property, the maternal law ruled in almost every division of the human race. The causes which gave rise to the modern family are analyzed and the following conclusion is arrived at as to possible future evolution:

"What we may anticipate about the adjustment of sexual relations after the impending downfall of capitalist production is mainly of a negative nature and mostly confined to elements that will disappear. But what will be added? That will be decided after a new generation has come to maturity; a race of men who never in their lives have had any occasion for buying with money or other economic means of power the surrender of a woman; a race of women who have never had any occasion for surrendering to any man for any other reason but love, or for refusing to surrender to their lover from fear of economic con-

sequences. Once such people are in the world, they will not give a moment's thought to what we to-day believe should be their course. They will follow their own practice and fashion their own public opinion about the individual practice of every person--only this and nothing more."

The remaining half of the book is given up to the discussion of the gradual evolution of the state. The first original forms of governmental organization as found in the "gens" is traced out among the Iroquois and the Greeks and its evolution into something approaching to the modern state in Athens. This same line of evolution is followed out among the Celts and Germans, showing the common character of evolution under the most diverse conditions, in many respects, but with the same economic environment. The final chapter on barbarism and civilization is a resume of the general steps in social evolution and the treatment of the origin of some institutions not discussed under the heads already mentioned. The book is really one of the two or three great socialist classics and now that it is in English it must find a place in the library of every one who hopes to master the real fundamental philosophy underlying socialism.

Trying to Cheat God. Marcus W. Robbins. Appeal to Reason Press. Paper, 60 pp. 15 cents.

The author compares this little bunch of essays to a chunk of "conglomerate" rock made up of "variously colored pebbles," and says the thoughts contained in them are not "original, neither are they startling, but merely what the average American picks up in his everyday reading." This is true, but the grouping and setting which he has given these "common thoughts" have made them very attractive reading and excellent propaganda for Socialism. The book consists of a series of essays not very closely connected, and largely based on what might be called historical texts. Some of the best of these are "The Builders of the Pyramids," a pithy, condensed history of human slavery; "The Robber Barons," discussing various forms of exploitation, and "The King Can Do No Wrong," a satire on the worship of authority. The essays abound in quaint and catchy phrases and telling hits. It is really something new and refreshing in the midst of a vast mass of commonplace material for Socialist propaganda.

Pages of Socialist History. W. Tcherkesoff. Published by C. B. Cooper, 114 Fifth ave., N. Y., 106 pp., 30 cents.

This is the sort of a book that would be written by a "DeLeonite" about a "Kangaroo." It has the same semblance of "evidence," the same reckless charges and personal invective that have so often disgraced Socialist controversies in the past. This purports to be a sort of expose of the sins and shortcomings of Social Democracy. It is really a re-hash of the charges and counter-charges that have been worn out years ago in all European countries but which come here with the appearance of fresh discoveries. The author does not seem to be aware of the fact that it would have no effect on the truth or falsity of Socialist premises if Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and Kautsky, against whom most of his venom is directed should all be

proven to be common thieves and degenerates, or any similar type of criminals. When he comes to discuss the doctrines of Socialism he becomes grotesque, re-hashes, without credit (although continuously charging plagiarism to everyone else) the long exploded statistics of Bernstein on concentration, repeats the stale and worn-out falsehoods about Socialists advocating state Socialism, and in general turns out a mess of stuff which will undoubtedly be accepted by those who are ignorant of the facts as valuable history.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A Socialist Library for Five Dollars.

Every Socialist Local, and every isolated Socialist who is trying to make enough converts to start a Local, should have a circulating library of books explaining the fundamental principles of scientific Socialism. Five dollars of course is not enough to buy a complete library, but we are now making, for the first time, a special offer which will enable our readers to have a better Socialist library than was ever offered before for the same amount of money. The books included in it are as follows:

The International Socialist Review, vol. I.....	\$2.00
The International Socialist Review, vol. II.....	2.00
Love's Coming-of-Age, Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
Britain for the British, Robert Blatchford.....	.50
Karl Marx, Memoirs by Wilhelm Liebknecht50
Collectivism, Emile Vandeveld50
The American Farmer, A. M. Simons.....	.50
The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-Operative Association.....	.50
The Origin of the Family, Frederick Engels.....	.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, Frederick Engels.....	.30

The books amount at retail prices to \$8.30. For \$5.00 we will send them, expressage prepaid, to any address in the United States. To any stockholder in our co-operative company we will send the same set, repaid, for \$4.00. This offer also applies to any one who now becomes a stockholder either by paying \$10.00 cash, or by paying \$1.00 down and agreeing to remit \$1.00 a month for nine months. Only 150 of these libraries are for sale since the number of bound volumes of the International Socialist Review is limited and no more can be had when the present supply is exhausted.

Crime and Criminals.

This new book, by Clarence S. Darrow, cannot be better described than by reproducing in full the characteristic preface written for it by the author as follows:

"This address is a stenographic report of a talk made to the prisoners in the Chicago jail. Some of my good friends have insisted that while my theories are true, I should not have given them to the inmates of a jail.

"Realizing the force of the suggestion that the truth should not

be spoken to all people, I have caused these remarks to be printed on rather good paper, and in a somewhat expensive form. In this way the truth does not become cheap and vulgar, and is only placed before those whose intelligence and affluence will prevent their being influenced by it."

The address is written in Mr. Darrow's best style and contains a great deal of truth not usually spoken in polite society. It is handsomely printed and bound and will be mailed to any address for 10 cents.

The Social Science Series.

This series, published by Swan Sonnenschein & Co., of London, contains a number of works which are of great value to every student of socialism. These books have hitherto been supplied to American readers through a New York importing house. The retail price has been fixed at \$1.00 for single numbers and \$1.25 for double numbers, and we have been unable to offer them to our stockholders at a discount for the reason that we could buy them only at a margin which barely covered the cost of handling. We have now, however, made arrangement to import these books direct, and we shall be able to supply them to our stockholders at 40 per cent discount by mail or 50 per cent discount by express. The books which will be included in our first importation are as follows:

SINGLE NUMBERS.

Work and Wages. J. E. Thorold Rogers.
 Civilization: Its Cause and Cure. Edward Carpenter.
 Quintessence of Socialism. Dr. Schaffle.
 Religion of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
 Ethics of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
 England's Ideal, etc. Edward Carpenter.
 Bismarck and State Socialism. W. H. Dawson.
 Story of the French Revolution. E. B. Bax.
 Evolution of Property. Paul Lafargue.
 German Socialism and F. Lassalle. W. H. Dawson.
 Outlooks from the New Standpoint. E. Belfort Bax.
 The Student's Marx. Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
 Ferdinand Lassalle. E. Bernstein.
 Parasitism: Organic and Social. Massart and Vandervelde.
 Revolution and Counter Revolution. Karl Marx.
 Over-Production and Crises. Karl Rodbertus.
 Village Communities in India. B. H. Baden Powell, M. A., C. I. E.

DOUBLE NUMBERS.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. F. Engels.
 Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome. W. Morris and E. B. Bax.
 The Economic Foundations of Society. Achille Loria.

These twenty books amount to \$20.75 at retail prices. We propose to import at once fifty sets of them for the benefit of our stockholders. The net price per set to our stockholders after the books arrive will

be \$10.38, purchaser to pay expressage. To any stockholder however, who will remit \$8.50 before October 31, we will send a set of the twenty books by express as soon as received from London. They should arrive the first week of December.

This offer is open to any one subscribing for stock during October, as well as to our present stockholders.

Our co-operative company will before long be in a position to furnish its stockholders with every Socialist book worth reading at a substantial discount from advertised prices. We do not however offer a discount on books not included in our list, for the reason that when we have to buy in small lots from other publishers, the discount we get does not pay the cost of handling.

Socialist Literature for Striking Coal Miners.

The last three issues of the International Socialist Review explain our plan for sending Socialist literature for distribution among the striking miners in the anthracite coal fields. The reports thus far received indicate that our literature is being used in Pennsylvania with excellent effect, and that the comrades there are taking advantage of the occasion to make new converts to Socialism at a most encouraging rate. All money received is used to send Socialist literature figured at our lowest stockholders' prices to comrades in the coal region who are vouched by the secretary of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania. Contributions thus far received are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$21.20
Joseph Bing, New York City.....	.45
John J. McLean, Washington, D. C.....	.50
I. E., Chicago	3.00
Chas. James Fox, New York City.....	10.00
"A Friend," Chicago	10.00
Charles H. Kerr & Company.....	10.00
Total	\$55.15

Our Socialist Co-operative Publishing House.

On pages 189 and 190 of last month's Review we announced a new departure in our co-operative plan, by which any Socialist may become a joint owner in our co-operative publishing house by paying one dollar a month for ten months, with the privilege of buying books at stockholders' prices as soon as the first payment is made. This offer has met with a prompt response from the Socialists of America. Thirty-five new stock subscriptions have been received during the month of September, bringing the number of our stockholders up to 460. The maximum number allowed under our present charter is 1,000, but we shall soon make application to the Secretary of State for an amended charter which will admit our enrolling 2,500. The publishing business carried on by our company is paying expenses and

the money received from the sale of stock is not used to make up deficits, but to pay the first cost of publishing new books. The faster new capital is subscribed, the more Socialist books we can publish.

"The Land of the Noonday Night."

This song, by Ernest Crosby, which was first published in the September number of the International Socialist Review, has been set to music by Eleanor Smith, one of the most successful composers in Chicago and is now published in sheet music form by Charles H. Kerr & Company. The music store price is 30 cents, but a copy will be mailed to any reader of the Review for 10 cents.

The Principles of Social Progress.

This work is by James Bale Morman, A. B. To quote from a review by William Thurston Brown, "It is one of the few essentially scientific treatments of the Social problem, and it is doubtful if an equally broad survey of history and biology in their relation to Social evolution can be found anywhere in print within the scope of 240 pages." The book is bound in cloth, and is equal in appearance to books usually sold at \$1.00. The price, however, is 50 cents postpaid, and we have lately made a new arrangement with the author by which we can offer it to our stockholders at 30 cents postpaid.

What to Read on Socialism.

This is the title of a 32 page booklet with red cover, uniform in size and style with the Pocket Library of Socialism, and into the preparation of which we have put an immense amount of labor. It explains first, the reasons why every intelligent reader should make a study of Socialism. Then comes a brief outline of the work done by the International Socialist Review, with the complete table of contents of the 27 numbers issued from the beginning up to and including the issue for September, 1902. This is followed by a descriptive paragraph on each of the Socialist books published by this house. These paragraphs are not written to show how admirable each book is (they are all admirable in our opinion, otherwise we shouldn't have published them); they are written as a guide to the reader which will enable him to judge which book gives the precise information he may be looking for. The last portion of the book describes the plan of organization of the Socialist Co-Operative Publishing House of Charles H. Kerr & Company. and the benefits both to the individual and the Socialist movement from subscribing for stock. A copy of this booklet will be mailed to any one requesting it. Packages for distribution will be supplied at much less than cost. We should offer them free but for the fact that in that case more copies would be asked for than could be distributed to good advantage. We will mail twenty copies for 10 cents or 100 for 50 cents, and will send

any number by express at purchaser's expense for 25 cents a hundred. If you can get a man to read Socialist literature he is bound to be a Socialist soon, and this booklet is the best thing we have yet been able to devise for inducing people to begin reading books on Socialism.

Announcement.

Just as we go to press, arrangements have been completed by which we become the publishers of "Socialism and the Social Movement of the Nineteenth Century," by Werner Sombart. This book has been recognized ever since its publication as one of the very best expositions of Socialism in existence, although written by one who does not wholly accept the Socialist position. It has been published hitherto by Putnam's Sons at \$1.25. We shall issue it in identically the same style, but will be able to furnish it to our stockholders at 60 cents, postpaid, and to others at one dollar. Order at once, as our first edition is not large and is apt to be exhausted shortly.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
56 Fifth ave., Chicago.

A SOCIALIST CLASSIC



THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, Private Property and the State

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated by Ernst Untermann.

There are a few books the reading of which constitutes a necessary foundation to an understanding of Socialism. One of these is Engels' "Origin of the Family." Hitherto this has not been accessible in English, although it has long been translated into almost every other European language.


It deals with fundamentals and traces the growth of those social institutions which are to the student of society what elements are to the chemist. Yet it is written in plain language easily understandable without the knowledge of any technical vocabulary.

It starts with the beginnings of human life and traces the institution of the family, of private property and the state from their first rude origins to their present forms, showing the great changes that have taken place in response to economic transformations.

As a study in Socialist philosophy of institutions, as a storehouse of information on fundamental points, there is no book of anything near the same size that can begin to rival it.

CLOTH, 218 PAGES, 50 CENTS POSTPAID.

**Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publrs'
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.**



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

NOVEMBER, 1902.

NO. 5.

The Western Labor Movement.

THERE seems to be considerable misapprehension, especially among Socialists, in regard to the trades-union movement of the Western States, whose delegates, recently assembled in National convention, adopted the platform of the Socialist Party and pledged the support of their organizations to the International Socialist movement. This radical departure from the effete and reactionary non-political policy of the American Federation of Labor, so long and so earnestly striven for by the Western leaders, and so entirely compatible with the Socialist conception of class-conscious and progressive trades-unionism, should have been met with the prompt and hearty approbation of every unionist and every Socialist in the land. That such was not the case, the luke-warm comment and the half-approving, half-condemning tone of the Socialist party press, with but one or two exceptions, bear convincing testimony, while the uncalled for, unwise and wholly unaccountable official pronouncement of the St. Louis "Quorum," purporting to speak for the National Committee, capped the climax of unfairness and injustice to the Western movement.

Stripped of unnecessary verbiage and free from subterfuge, the Socialist party has been placed in the attitude of turning its back upon the young, virile, class-conscious union movement of the West, and fawning at the feet of the "pure and simple" movement of the East, and this anomalous thing has been done by men who are supposed to stand sponsor to the party and whose utterance is credited with being *ex cathedra* upon party affairs.

They may congratulate themselves that upon this point at least they are in perfect accord with the capitalist press, and also with the "labor lieutenants," the henchment and heelers, whose duty it is to warn the union against Socialism and guard its members against working-class political action.

The writer takes issue with these comrades upon this vital

proposition; and first of all insists that they (including the members of the Quorum) speak for themselves alone, as they undoubtedly have the right to do, and that their declaration in reference to the American Labor Union is in no sense a party expression, nor is it in any matter binding upon the party, nor is the party to be held responsible for the same.

As a matter of fact the rank and file of the Socialist party, at least so far as I have been able to observe, rejoice in the action of the Denver convention, hail it as a happy augury for the future and welcome with open arms the Western comrades to fellowship in the party.

"Why didn't they stay in the Federation of Labor and carry on their agitation there? Why split the labor movement?" This is made the burden of the opposition to the Western unionists who refused to be assimilated by Mark Hanna's "Civic Federation"—the pretext for the scant, half-hearted recognition of their stalwart working-class organization and their ringing declaration in favor of Socialism and in support of the Socialist party.

And this objection may be dismissed with a single sentence. Why did not those who urge it remain in the Socialist Labor Party and carry on their agitation there? Why split the Socialist movement?

It is not true that the Western unionists set up a rival organization from geographical or sectional considerations, or to antagonize the Federation; and they who aver the contrary know little or nothing about the Western movement, nor about the causes that brought it into existence. A brief review of these may throw some light upon the subject.

In 1896 the annual convention of the Federation of Labor was held in Cincinnati. The Western Federation of Miners, at that time an affiliated organization, was represented by President Edward Boyce and Patrick Clifford, of Colorado. The strike of the Leadville miners, more than 3,000 in number, one of the bloodiest and costliest labor battles ever fought, was then in progress and had been for several months. The drain and strain on the resources of the Western Federation had been enormous. They needed help and they needed it sorely. They had always poured out their treasure liberally when help was needed by other organizations, East as well as West, and now that they had reached their limit, they naturally expected prompt and substantial aid from affiliated organizations. Boyce and Clifford appealed to the delegates. To use their own language they were "turned down," receiving but vague promises which, little as they meant, were never fulfilled. At the close of the convention they left for home, disappointed and disgusted. They stopped off at Terre Haute to urge me to go to Leadville to lend a helping hand to

the striking miners, which I proceeded to do as soon as I could get ready for the journey. It was here that they told me that the convention was a sore surprise to them, that three or four men had votes enough to practically control the whole affair and that the dilatory and reactionary proceedings had destroyed their confidence in the Federation.

Afterward I was told by the officers in charge of the strike that no aid of the least value, or even encouragement, had been rendered by the Federation of Labor and that the financial contributions were scarcely sufficient to cover the expense of the canvass for same.

It was not long after this that the Western miners withdrew from the Federation and a couple of years later, conceiving the necessity of organizing all classes of labor in the Western States, which as yet had received but scant attention, the American Labor Union was organized, the Western Federation of Miners being the first organization in affiliation with the new central body.

But notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Western Miners from the American Federation they continued loyally to support the Eastern boycotts levied by the Federation, and it is a fact not to be gainsaid that while some of those boycotts were so feebly supported in the East, where they had been levied, as to be practically impotent, the union men of the West recognized them as scrupulously as if imposed by their own organization, and in Montana and other States drove the boycotted Eastern products out of the Western markets.

So far as I am able to inform myself there is no instance on record where the American Federation of Labor, or any organization affiliated with it, ever sanctioned or supported a boycott levied by the Western unions.

On the contrary, cases can be cited where the Eastern organizations bluntly refused to recognize boycotts declared by the Western organization.

Not only this, but the Western unions have always contributed promptly and liberally to the financial support of all labor unions, East and West, North and South, affiliated and otherwise, Butte leading with thousands of dollars in support of all kinds of strikes, in all sections of the country, the liberality and loyalty of the Western Federation of Miners in such cases being proverbial—and yet I have never heard of an instance where the Western unions received a dollar from any Eastern organization since the withdrawal of the Miners' Federation.

At this very time, while the miners of the East are making a desperate struggle against starvation, the miners of the far West, affiliated with the tabooed American Labor Union, are

contributing from their hard earnings to the support of the Pennsylvania strikers, though they never expect to receive a penny from the East; and President Moyer of the Western Federation of Miners is sending messages to President Mitchell of the United Mine Workers. Still more—notwithstanding the bituminous miners of the Middle States, members of the same organization as the anthracite strikers, decided not to strike in support of their anthracite brethren, President Moyer and Secretary Haywood of the Western Federation wired President Mitchell that in their judgment all the miners in the country should stand by the Pennsylvania strikers and that the coal miners of the Western Union were ready to a man to lay down their tools until the anthracite strike was won.

This is the militant, progressive, liberal spirit of Western unionism—now re-enforced with a class-conscious political program—that could not brook the ultra-conservative policy of the Eastern movement, and seceded from it with motives as loyal to labor as ever prompted men to action.

The opponents of the Western Labor Union may search the annals of organized labor in vain, all the circumstances considered, for as noble an example of fidelity to the principles of union labor, as that of President Moyer and Secretary Haywood of the Western Federation, speaking for the coal miners of the Western States, having no grievance of their own and belonging to another organization, to which the East, if not hostile, was at least not friendly, voluntarily agreeing to lay down their tools, and give up their jobs to help their fellowmen more than two thousand miles distant whom they had never seen and never expected to see.

Had the situation been reversed and the miners of Montana had gone on strike, would the Eastern unions have sent any money out there, or would the Eastern miners have volunteered to strike in sympathy with their Western brethren?

The conventions of the Western Labor Unions, the Western Federation of Miners and the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' Union, held simultaneously at Denver in May last, attracted wide attention chiefly because of their declaration in favor of Socialism and their adoption of an independent political program. Prior to this these organizations were rarely mentioned, in fact almost unknown in the Eastern and Middle States and no reference to them was ever made by the capitalist press outside their own immediate jurisdiction. But the very moment they declared in favor of Socialism, the capitalist press, the "pure and simple" union element and, strange to say, some socialists, "Cry Havoc, and let slip the dogs of war." As for the socialists who joined in the outcry, or "damned with faint praise," they

were perhaps persuaded, after a survey of the East and then the West, that it was wiser policy to curry favor with numbers than to stand by principles.

The impression prevails in some quarters that the American Labor Union was first instituted at the convention in Denver last May. This is erroneous, as the organization has been in existence several years, and at the late convention simply changed its name from the Western Labor Union to the American Labor Union to more properly describe its expanding jurisdiction.

Fault has been found because of the rival disposition shown by the convention to the American Federation and the purpose to invade other sections and organize rival unions, thereby dividing the movement and precipitating a factional labor war.

The delegates to the Denver convention considered this phase of question in all its bearings; they did not propose to antagonize the American Federation, nor to invade its jurisdiction, nor set up rival unions, they simply proposed to protect their own movement in the Western States and they did not propose to allow attacks to be made upon it without resenting them; and when they finally took action, even in the matter of changing their name, it was in self-defense, for from every quarter, even some of their own disgruntled element who sought to defeat the proposed adoption of Socialism, came the threat that if the Western Union did not return to the American Federation, the latter would send a corps of organizers into the Western States to institute rival unions and "wipe the Western movement off the earth."

The "pure and simple" element in Denver and vicinity, affiliated with the American Federation, and not a few of the local politicians, who saw their doom in the Socialist tendency of the convention, were loud and persistent in the threat of "annihilation" if the delegates refused to vote for affiliation with the American Federation. While there I heard it frequently upon the street and elsewhere and in fact Secretary Morrison, who, with Thomas I. Kidd, of the Executive Council, represented the American Federation at the convention with the purpose of inducing the Western Labor Union to dissolve, and its affiliated organizations to join the American Federation, gave it out that if the delegates declined their overtures, the American Federation would proceed to organize in all the Western States, as it acknowledged no boundary line to its jurisdiction in the United States.

The charge, therefore, of "invasion" and "rival unions" against the Western movement, falls to the ground. It can be proven beyond doubt that the Western movement acted upon the defensive in this matter and that only when the threat to "wipe them out of existence" in their own territory was made, did they conclude

to extend their jurisdiction to such sections as desired to embrace their organization.

If it is held that the American Federation had prior jurisdiction, it may be answered that George the Third and Great Britain had prior jurisdiction over the colonies, and that the jurisdiction of the Knights of Labor antedated that of the American Federation, and the National Labor Union that of the Knights of Labor and so on back without end.

Whatever difference may have prompted the separation several years ago—and whether it was wise or otherwise, I shall not now consider, having no share in the praise or blame, as the action was taken by the Western miners upon their own motion and they are entirely willing to accept the responsibility—it is certain that there is to-day a radical fundamental difference between the Eastern and Western wings of the American Labor movement and that in their present state and with their present conflicting policies and tendencies, they can not be united and even if they could be, factional and sectional strife would be at once engendered and disruption would be inevitable.

The Western movement could only have consented to go *back and backward* to the American Federation by stultifying itself and betraying and humiliating its thousands of progressive members who are far enough advanced to recognize the futility of labor organization without class-conscious political action and who will never retrace their steps to the fens and bogs of “pure and simple” unionism.

The Western men want unity and they want harmony, but they will not go backward, they will not sacrifice progress to reaction to secure it.

They have declared their class-consciousness and they can not and will not snuff out that beacon light to emancipation.

They have committed their organization to the Socialist Party and they can not unite with an organization that is hostile to independent political action by the working class.

There is one way and one only to unite the American trades-union movement. The American Federation of Labor must go forward to the American Labor Union; the American Labor Union will never go back to the American Federation of Labor. Numbers count for nothing; principle and progress for everything.

When the American Federation of Labor sheds its outgrown “pure and simple” policy, when it declares against the capitalist system and for union, class-conscious action at the ballot box, as the supreme test of union principles, as the American Labor Union has done; when it relegates “leaders” to the rear who secure fat offices for themselves in reward for keeping the rank and file in

political ignorance and industrial slavery, when it shall cease to rely upon cringing lobbying committees, begging, like Lazarus at the gate of Dives, for a bone from a capitalist legislature and Congress it helped to elect, and marshals its members in class-array against their exploiters on election day to vote their own class into power, then unity will come and the Western men will hail with joy that day. And it is coming. It is simply bound to come.

In the meantime there need be no quarrel between the East and West and there will be none unless the threatened attempt to "snuff out" the West should materialize, in which case the "snuffers" will be entitled to the credit of having inspired a refreshing exhibition of the "staying" qualities of the class-conscious trades-union movement of the Western State.

The speaking tour of the national officers and executive council of the American Federation, in the mountain States, following the Denver convention, and widely heralded by the capitalist press as an "uprising of the conservative element of organized labor to squelch the Western radicals" can claim anything but a victory if that was the program of President Gompers and his colleagues. Some of their meetings, with all the advertising they received, scarcely amounted to a "corporal's guard," and where they had hundreds, the meetings held under the auspices of the Western Union had thousands in attendance without the aid of capitalist newspapers and in spite of the opposition of capitalist politicians.

As to whether the Western movement is growing or declining since the Denver convention, it is sufficient to say that the reports show that during the month of September the organizations affiliated with the American Labor Union added more than four thousand new names to their rolls of membership.

Passing through Denver recently I noticed by the papers of that city in scare-head articles, that the organizer of the American Federation, who had just been interviewed upon the subject, declared in emphatic terms that he had been instructed from headquarters at Washington to organize rival unions at every available point and where there was even one applicant, to admit him, totally regardless of the American Labor Union. If this is to be the policy of the Eastern Federation it will have to be that of the Western Union and as a result we shall have an era of unprecedented activity in the work of organizing the trades-union movement of the country.

One thing is noticeable in this connection and that is that the American Federation has evinced a greater interest in the Western States, spent more money and worked harder to organize

them in the comparatively short time since the Western Union is in the field than in all previous years.

The rise of class-conscious trades-unionism in the West was not the result of mere chance or personal design, but obedient to the rising tide of the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat of the rugged and sparsely settled mountain States, a composite population composed of pioneers, the most adventurous, brave and freedom-loving men from all States of the American continent, and it is impossible that they, with their keen instinct and revolutionary tendency could be long content to creep along in the creaking chariot of conservatism, even though it still bear traces of the union label.

The class-conscious union movement of the West is historic in origin and development and every Socialist should recognize its mission and encourage its growth. It is here that the tide will reach its flood and thence roll into other regions where needed and hastening the glorious

and, not the enemy of the American Federation of Labor, but to conserve, not destroy it. I am opposed, not to the organization or its members, many of whom are perfectly honest, but to those who are restraining its evolution and preventing it from fulfilling its true mission.

Do not convert it into a political organization, but simply let it develop and have it, as it must become if it is a class-conscious industrial union, its members recognize the ballot as the weapon of their class and using it to escape the incongruities and self-contradictions of the "pure and simple" union, whose members are content to boycott the effects of the capitalist system and strive seriously to perpetuate the system.

There are elements of progress at work within the Federation. Let them continue their efforts. Such men as J. W. Slayton, J. Mahlon Barnes and many others have done and are doing excellent work on the subject and no hinderance to expect from the West-

Hayes, elected delegate to the approaching conference of the American Federation of Labor by a popular vote of the International Typographical Union, upon his resignation as a Socialist, and now muzzled by an order of the Executive Committee instructing him to vote against Socialist objects to a little help from the outside.

So progressive forces will meet and the work which has been accomplished.

In the past, I shall support every boycott and

every strike of the American Federation of Labor, and every organization affiliated with it, to the best of my ability, and when they lose in any of these struggles, no disheartening word from my lips shall darken their counsels or add to the bitterness of their defeat.

I have been plain and unreserved in my criticism as I have a right to be. For many years I have been an unofficial organizer for the Federation of Labor, and for all the trades-unions connected with it, and in my travels, especially the past seven years in which I have been almost continuously traversing the country, I have organized and been the means of organizing hundreds of unions of all kinds. In the Southern States I held the first great labor meetings when there was little or no trace of organization, in many places not even a single member, and I at once set to work organizing each point with the result that when I covered the same territory shortly after, there were unions everywhere and the movement spread rapidly over that section of the country. In view of these facts I think I can consistently assert the right of candid criticism.

The attitude of the Socialist Party toward the trades-union movement broadly endorsing and commending it, but stopping there, and allowing it to manage its own internal affairs is, without doubt, the correct one, as any intermeddling must result in harm with no possible hope of good. The party, as such, must continue to occupy this friendly yet non-interfering position, but the members may, of course, and in my judgment should join the trades-unions East and West and North and South and put forth their best efforts to bring the American labor movement to its rightful position in the struggle for emancipation.

Eugene V. Debs.

A True Philosophy of Fashion.

THE truth is always a very simple thing when we once get at it, and our true philosophy of fashion can be stated in a few words. Briefly it is this: The tyranny that fashion exercises over men, like all other tyrannies, is a result of inequality of condition, and originates in the desire of the more fortunately circumstanced to emphasize their superiority and differentiate themselves as conspicuously as possible from their less fortunate fellow creatures in the cut and material of their clothing. Remove the cause and you get rid of the evil.

The truth of this proposition may not be apparent at first sight, but if the reader will have patience to glance back with me a moment at the origin and history of dress, he will see that there is nothing new or strange in the view propounded, but that it rests on foundations as old as human nature itself.

Ethnologists are pretty well agreed that dress had its origin in love of adornment, and not, as might be supposed, in native modesty, or a utilitarian desire to keep out the cold. The traditional fig leaf which does such conspicuous service in modern museums of sculpture as a *lucus a non lucendo* to the innocent, may have had some reference to that virtue in the beginning, but the first naked savage that ran a brass ring through his nose, or daubed himself with red clay, was thinking, not of hiding his nakedness or warming his bones, but of exciting the admiration of his harem or inspiring terror to his enemies. From these simple beginnings vanity and love of display would in time develop all the marvels of toilet, savage and civilized. The habit of covering the body, for whatever purpose, once formed, the sense of modesty would next be developed. So long as man goes naked he is not ashamed, but clothe him and he learns to blush.

That dress originated modesty and not vice versa, is evident from the conventionality of its requirements. In some countries delicacy forbids a woman to uncover her face in public. With us of the west, not only the face, but arms and shoulders, and under certain conditions appalling expanses of bare back and bosom also, may be displayed with impunity, while no form of dress is tolerated which suggests the faintest suspicion that women may be possessed of such useful and necessary appendages as legs. Even the very word is included in this conventional taboo, as are the feet also, to some extent; she would be a bold woman who should venture to appear on the streets of some of our American cities, even in a February slush, with skirts up to her ankles. On the other hand, we are so accustomed to seeing the waist and bust outlined by what are considered well-fitting garments that any loose drapery which conceals the waist line is thought inelegant, if not

immodest, as witness the disgust excited in the average masculine breast by a loose Mother Hubbard gown some years ago, when that comfortable garment made an effort to assert itself for house wear. But I am getting off the track; let us return to the "previous question."

As the first rude attempts at ornament were gradually developed into what we know as dress, the covering for the body would naturally take, in warm climates, the form of loose, flowing draperies, which would screen the person without confining it, and hence the Greek *peplum*, the Roman toga, and the Arab burnouse. By degrees, as the slowly evolving *homo sapiens* pushed his way, or was pushed by others, toward the inhospitable regions of the north, the desirability of clothing as a protection against cold would suggest itself, and the bifurcated garment, so necessary to comfort in cold climates, would speedily be evolved.

Thus far the art of dress has been developing along strictly natural and healthy lines. Trousers and petticoats, or whatever primitive patterns took their place, the two distinctive types of dress, have come into existence not in response to sexual, but to climatic differences. Men and women alike clothed themselves rationally, according to the climate they lived in or the work they had to do. Loose, flowing robes met the needs of the people along the sunny shores of the Mediterranean, while close-fitting leggings warmed the limbs of the dwellers on the stormy Baltic. And so the human race might have gone on, clothing itself rationally and comfortably, to the great advantage of both sexes, had not fashion interfered with a senseless decree condemning the civilized world to an arbitrary distinction in the dress of the sexes that has worked great detriment to both. No matter what the condition in which he may be placed, whether amid the scorching sands of Sahara, the steaming jungles of India, in the negligé of his own chamber, or the festive graces of the ball room, Caucasian man must encase himself in the compact, double-barreled garments that were devised primarily as a defense against wind and cold. On the other hand, civilized woman, just because she is a woman, regardless of climate or occupation, whether riding horseback, pedalling a bicycle, or heading her way against a March wind, has no choice but to encumber herself with the flowing draperies fit only for repose and sunshine. Even the plainest teachings of hygiene cannot free her from the necessity that fashion imposes of sweeping up the filth of the streets with her skirts and conveying it, with all its possibilities of infection, into her home.

If we look a little deeper into the matter, we shall see that this primal absurdity of fashion is, as our philosophy teaches, but the natural result of inequality of condition. Dress having originated, as already remarked, in the love of adornment, would soon become

a symbol of rank and distinction, and the king, and the great man generally, would be known by the gorgeousness of his attire. As long as the human race was confined to the warmer regions of the earth, in which it probably had its origin, there would be no marked differentiation of male and female dress, both men and women adopting, as a matter of course, the loose, flowing style that nature and common sense would alike dictate as suited to the relaxation of a southern clime. The rich and great would signalize their importance by arraying themselves and those belonging to them in jewels and costly stuffs, but there would be little change in the cut of their clothes from generation to generation. In primitive civilizations differences of rank are so clearly defined and so universally acquiesced in that its peculiar style of dress is prescribed by immemorial custom to each class, and the rich dandy need have no fear that the cut of his gorgeous mantle will be duplicated in cheap material and vulgarized by some aspiring plebeian; hence there is no need for him to be continually changing it in order to defeat the misplaced ambition of the vulgar.

But when the restless sons of the north come upon the scene, we have a different story. The narrow bifurcated garment, so well adapted to utilitarian purposes, is ill-fitted, by its narrowness and general paltriness of appearance, for the display of ornament. The man in breeches has no chance to cut a figure in dress compared with the wearer of the graceful bornouse or the stately toga. But it is human to take pride in whatever advantages we may possess and to desire to impress others with a sense of our superiority; and so, when the man in breeches began to prosper and grow rich, as he did by and by, to a degree never attained by man before, he naturally looked to splendor of costume as a means of signaling his importance and prosperity. But the rational bifurcated garment, with the freedom of limb it allowed, was too comfortable and convenient, too well adapted to the needs of a busy, restless race, to be discarded for the graceful, but cumbersome robes of the south, so man kept his comfortable trousers for himself and put his women folk into petticoats, to wear his finery for him, and make his display by proxy. In proportion to the splendor in which he arrayed his womankind he could afford to neglect display in his own person, and so comfort and utility came to be consulted more and more in male attire and ornament in female, until the woman of modern western civilization has come to outdo all the rest of the world in the extravagance, the irrationality, and the inutility of her costume.

Another means for exhibiting the power and importance of the great man—chief, king, nabob, millionaire, whatever name he may be called by in the different phases of his evolution—is by the number of idle and useless people he can afford to keep about

him. Slaves, vassals, men-at-arms, followers and flunkies of all sorts, and in some stages of society, wives galore, have surrounded the man of power like satellites and added to his splendor by the luster of their reflected light. Solomon's three thousand wives were as much a part of his glory as his "forty thousand stalls of horses for chariots" and his "twelve thousand horsemen." The poor man's wives being objects of use rather than adornment, he is not likely to take more of them than he can find profitable employment for in cooking and washing and other household drudgery, and their dress is not devised for show. But the rich man reflects distinction on himself by keeping his women in idleness and luxury. Hence, incapacity for serving any useful purpose becomes the ideal of the fine lady in all lands, and the more obvious her purely ornamental function can be made to appear, the more completely does she subserve the purpose of her existence. Among the Chinese this object is attained by maiming the feet of their women of quality and making them cripples for life. Western nations accomplish the same result by compressing their waists and putting them into straitjackets of various kinds, called corsets, or by encumbering them with bustles and crinoline and long trains and high-heeled shoes, and other devices for making useful occupation of any kind impossible to a "well dressed" woman.

But the western nations are democratic. They do not acquiesce in distinction of rank as quietly as their less aspiring eastern brethren. They have a theory that one man is just as good as another, and all women a little better, and theoretically they will not allow distinctions in dress any more than they will acknowledge distinctions in rank. It is not that the bulk of mankind are snobs, as Mr. Thackeray would have had us believe, and try to imitate the rich for the mere desire to be like them, but they resent having the cut of their clothes made the badge of an inferiority which they do not admit to exist. They feel an instinctive desire to break through the artificial barrier of fashion, the most conspicuous of all the barriers that wealth has sought to raise about itself. Hence the wives and daughters of working men, and men of moderate means everywhere, endeavor to follow the fashions set by the rich, at what cost of misery and discomfort to themselves, most of us know only too well. For fashion takes no note of the working classes. She never busies herself inventing pretty and convenient costumes for them; and ten to one they would not adopt them if she did, for such a dress, under our present social conditions, would be the mark of an offensive distinction quite out of keeping with democratic theories.

However this may be, fashion has never yet succeeded in devising any mode so ugly or uncomfortable as to hinder the average woman from trying to follow it if she can get hold of a piece

of cloth and a pair of scissors. It is not that she loves the fashion for its own sake or takes pride in aping those who invented it, but that she would escape the imputation of inferiority which being out of the fashion implies. Wealth and privilege, then, must resort to a fresh device for balking the ambition of the "vulgar," and hence those sudden changes of style that so often frustrate the labor of the industrious matron, after she has, with infinite pains, changed a last year's gown to look like the latest model in the shop windows, only to find that this, in turn, has been superceded by a newer fad. The more complete the success of these imitators, the more certain their discomfiture, for no sooner has a style been "vulgarized" by general use, than whist! your arbiters of elegance cast it aside as common and unclean, and straightway seek for new inventions to distinguish them from the unregarded throng of the "*ignobile vulgus*."

With such a function to fulfill, it is not to be expected that fashion should concern itself about the comfort or the utility of clothing. On the contrary, these qualities are rather to be avoided as commending a mode too readily to the common herd whose imitative propensities it is fashion's chief aim to foil. Its regulations, framed as they are in the interest of a privileged class, must, from the very nature of the case, bear hard upon—I will not say the poor merely, but upon those in moderate circumstances. The unwritten law which declares it bad form to appear upon the street with the smallest parcel in your hand was not framed for the convenience of the woman with six children at home and only a single hired girl to help; and the abolition of short skirts for street wear assuredly never have been sanctioned by a convention who do not have carriages always at their command. Fashion is regarded chiefly as a medium for display, a part of the wealth and position, by which they distinguish themselves from the rest of the world. Hence it has an eye rather to the novel and fantastic and difficult of imitation than to what is useful or becoming, or even to what is intrinsically beautiful. It is not to be surprised therefore to find that its decisions are governed by neither reason nor good taste, and that life is often made harder to the rank and file of womankind, who feel that they must keep up with the fashion, though the effort exhausts them and prevents them from more useful employment, and the mode itself may be wholly unsuited to their means and occupation. This vulgarization of the public taste through cheap imitations of styles designed exclusively in the interest of the rich is one of the worst effects of the tyranny of fashion as it now exists. Where is the power strong enough to break the yoke of this upon humankind has imposed upon its own neck? Men submit to the yoke of fashion so long that they seem to have

fallen into a superstitious acquiescence with it as a sort of divine necessity inherent in the nature of things, against which it is useless to strive. They accept its wildest decrees with a sort of fatalistic resignation to the inevitable, and regard any proposal to substitute reason for caprice in its realm as the dream of a crank, impracticable as the discovery of the philosopher's stone or the invention of a Keeley motor. While the prevalence of law and order is admitted in every other province of life, the self-evident fact seems to have escaped observation that it is just as much the nature of fashion as of any other human creation to be rational and sensible if evolved by rational and sensible beings. It is just as natural that our dress and mode of living should be governed by reason and common sense as that our civil and political institutions should be so. There is no more reason in nature why a man, or a woman either, for that matter, should clothe themselves uncomfortably or inappropriately than that they should cultivate thorns in their orchards or plant a garden with thistles. The trouble is not with nature—unless it is human nature—but with the unnatural social conditions under which we are living. Once remove the artificial inequalities which are leading one-half the world on a wild chase after novelty in order to distinguish themselves from the other half, and reason and good taste will at once take the place of caprice and extravagance in setting the fashions.

This brings us back to our starting point, namely, that the tyranny of fashion is a result of inequality of condition; and as economic inequality is the root of all other, it is clear that if we remove this, the arbitrary function of fashion as it now exists will at once disappear. When dress comes to be the index, not of a man's power and importance, that is to say, of his economic superiority over other men, but merely of his individual taste and refinement, then fashion will no longer have for its chief object the invention of fantastic modes for the distinction of their wearers from the rest of mankind. It will seek rather the beautiful, the comfortable, the appropriate. If all were equally free to indulge their individual taste or convenience, fashion in dress, by a natural process of evolution, would soon become synonymous with propriety and good taste. We might still be led to imitate others, but it would be only when they invented something especially beautiful or appropriate, and the whole feminine world would not go into hoop skirts because some royal personage happened to be enceinte, or fetter itself in skin-tight sleeves because some popular actress had a pretty arm. Splendor or novelty in dress would no longer mark its wearer as in any way distinguished in fortune above his fellows, but would merely indicate that he chose to spend his share of the common revenue in a way that might, or might not reflect credit on him, according as his costume was graceful and

appropriate or the reverse. The attempt to distinguish oneself by wearing what was ugly or fantastic or uncomfortable, would probably meet with the ridicule it deserved, for there would be no distinction in doing what all others were equally free to do if they chose.

Nor is there any reason to fear that the absence of a conventional standard of fashion would cause all the world to sink down to a dead level of monotony in dress. On the contrary, our conventional standard is a great cause of uniformity. Take your stand on Broadway any fine morning and watch the procession go by, all got up on pretty much the same pattern; all in big hats or little hats, full skirts or scanty ones, round capes or long coats, as the prevailing mode may be, without regard to the requirements of the different forms and features of the wearers. But where each one is free to follow his or her individual taste and convenience, we may be sure there will be no lack of variety; and the province of fashion no longer being to seek out fantastic and irrational modes to distinguish the privileged few, we may trust the innate love of beauty that dwells in every human heart to provide that only such inventions as are intrinsically beautiful and graceful will be generally adopted. Above all, the vulgarity of making cheap imitations of the finery of the rich will disappear. This is at the bottom of nearly all the bad taste we see displayed in the dress of the poor, and this temptation removed, each will feel free to choose among the variety of styles prevailing, what is personally becoming, without regard to what a richer neighbor may wear. Everybody having to do some part of the world's work, comfortable and appropriate business costumes will be invented for each trade and profession, and what is more, nobody will be ashamed to wear them.

To sum up: when it ceases to be anybody's interest to invent ugly and irrational costumes; when nobody's pride can be flattered and nobody's importance enhanced by mere extravagance in dress, then, and then only, may we expect to see intelligence and good taste take the place of the pride and selfishness that now regulate the fashions of the civilized world. Make men, and women, too, economically equal, so that there will be no room for one class to set themselves above their fellows on account of mere adventitious distinctions, and dress will become simply a matter of taste and convenience, as it ought to be. This is the only way to free mankind—or perhaps I ought to say womankind, as they are the chief sufferers—from the tyranny of fashion, and until this is done, philosophers may rail, moralists may groan, reason and common sense may protest, but we shall never get the human race to clothe itself rationally.

F. F. ANDREWS.

Begging!—for Work.



MAN beseeching fellowman for work, for a chance to earn the means to keep the life within his frame, within the form of him or her he loves!

What curst conditions cause such scene and fact to be?

O sight more fit to stir Omnipotence on High to slaying-wrath than all the wars or brothels, thefts or lies, murders or suicides from time of Cain till now!

Here is the war, in guise of peace, that slaughters, hour by hour, its unreported hecatombs—and leaves the widows pensionless;

Here is the prostitution (of the Soul)—more damn'd than harlotry's most damn'd and unrestrained debauch;

Here is the theft that beggars world-accumulated theft—the theft that makes the victim cringe low to the thief;

Here is the lie all lies above: "*This work is mine to give, withhold;*"

Here is the murder of a MAN—how insignificant the slaughter or mutilation of the body now appears;

Here is the suicide of many souls,—asphyxiated by a sophistry of thieves: "'Tis in my purse—'tis *therefore* mine!"

A man beseeching work from fellowman?

O ye beguileable humanitarians, still striving to stop leaks when bottom's out, unstop the ears,—hark to the sounds; tear open eyes,—behold the sights, and know the hour for patching's past.

O ye Peace-pleaders, painstakingly persistent, spending strength and skill in striking plumes, gold-lace and epaulettes from much be-Captained and be-General'd rampant murderers,—strike at the steed, strike at the steed! and level all.

A man beseeching fellowman for work.

Come! Gaze within the crowded room where hundreds slave with feverish speed past strength's exhaustion point,

Come! Gaze where they find rest—the asylum for insane, the unmarkt grave.

My brother has been sent away with harsh reply: “WE HAVE NO WORK FOR YOU.”

Great is thy patience O Omnipotence, that sends not Death—most sudden Death—to devastate this world to bring relief to poor whom life brings naught; to bring the end of much-prized life to rich whom it gives all—*but love for fellowman.*

Edward Arnold Brenholts.

Individualistic Survivals Under Socialism.

ONE of the most striking truths disclosed by the doctrine of evolution, is, that the entire complex mechanism of modern industry and all the diversified economic activities which civilized men engage in, have grown by slow degrees out of the few simple biologic or vital activities carried on by the animal organism. Primitive life is essentially individualistic. The purely physical needs of the brute, can, in almost all instances, be fully satisfied by its own unaided physical powers, but as man, the "tool-using animal," appeared upon the stage, his gradually increasing wants made necessary more elaborate methods of meeting them. Thus arose production, or the conscious and planful transforming of raw material into objects of utility, and thus by a further step arose the system of the division of labor and the separation of the workers into the different trades. With the continuous development of industry and the discovery of the advantages of association and of co-operation, the factory system and later the trust system arose and hundreds and thousands and then hundreds of thousands of men became co-workers in the same establishment or under the same corporation.

In this manner at successive periods successively more advanced and more effective methods of satisfying wants became predominant, but be it noticed that during each of these periods of higher development the characteristic forms of economic activity of the preceding periods did not become entirely extinct but were merely greatly restricted in their range. At the present time, for example, when we have reached the highest of the above mentioned stages of industrial development there still survive in abundance and at the very heart of our civilization types of all the past economic forms.

It must not be supposed, however, that these necessarily represent in every case an instance of arrested development. Various needs of the individual and of society can only be satisfied by methods that do not allow of the use of mechanical devices or large scale production, and just as the physiological functions such as digestion, respiration, etc., which although they represent the most fundamental of these needs have remained and must always remain individualistic because inherently so, so must there also remain economic functions or occupations that are inherently individualistic.

On the other hand, we notice in the case of the animal organism, which is the prototype of the social organism, that the

higher the degree of development the more numerous and important become the functions of the organism as a whole, the functions under the control of the center of consciousness, and that chief among such functions are those corresponding to production as, for example, the obtaining and storing up of food, the building of nests, etc. What is more logical, then, than to suppose that as the social organism develops, production must here also become a function appertaining, in general, to the whole, instead of to the parts? At any rate, whatever our *theories* may be, the logic of *facts*, the facts unfolding in the industrial world, points indisputably to co-operation, co-operation to the furthest possible degree, as the coming rule in the economic life of society. The existing trusts represent but a passing stage of development the outcome of which must be the establishment of a trust of trusts comprising as equal shareholders every man, woman and child in the land and undertaking in the interest of the whole of society and in so far as is practicable all economic activities.

What, then, is the boundary line between, or the distinguishing feature or features of that class of occupations which we may expect under Socialism to continue to be carried on, and quite properly so, by private individuals, or even groups, for their own private gain and independently of the central and collective industrial administration, and that far wider field of industrial effort which will in the future be wholly controlled and occupied by the community in its corporate and economic capacity?

The answer to this must seem clear when we consider the genesis of industrial activities in general and of any given economic occupation in particular.

Primitive man emerging from the state of animality knew no other form of co-operation than that carried on within the family circle. Before men learned that to labor for each other was the better way to satisfy their own individual needs every man labored for himself and by himself. But the increase of population, making it impossible to subsist by the chase, forced men into a more intensive and economical utilization of the resources of nature and of their own energy by the practice of agriculture and the mechanical arts. Through the gradually increasing division of labor which this involved it became more and more difficult and finally impossible for any man to supply all his needs directly by the labor of his own hands and men were thus impelled with ever greater force towards the system of informal and limited co-operation prevailing to-day. Where in the beginning every one produced by himself all that he required incipient civilization forced men to produce, for the larger part, not directly for their own consumption but for the purpose of

exchange, while at a still later period, as at the present time, most workers do not individually produce even the whole of any one article, whatever it may be, in the exclusive manufacture of which they have now come to be engaged, but only a part of it. This advance from the direct to the indirect method of satisfying wants has been the characteristic feature of industrial progress. A like increasing indirectness may be noted in the application of the mechanical aids to production where hand labor, that is, direct labor, is constantly making way for machinery, that is, indirect labor, and where the machinery itself is becoming ever more and more complicated.

Now no one prefers, and there is no reason why any one should prefer, to do a thing by an indirect and roundabout process when he can accomplish his purpose *as well* in a direct manner. Primitive individualistic production for use is obviously a more direct process of satisfying wants than is the system of associative production for sale or exchange, and it is only as in the course of the progress of society the superior economy of the latter method of production comes to be daily demonstrated over an enlarging area of the field of industry that men are forced to abandon economic independence for economic interdependence.

Collective production, then, is not an end in itself, but is a means to an end, the greater happiness of the individual. Since men seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion, whatever method of satisfying a given desire requires the least exertion, the least expenditure of energy, is the best method for that particular purpose, whether it may or may not be the best for other purposes.

Now just as labor in all its forms, whether collective or individualistic, is, as we have seen, only a development of those physiological functions automatically or semi-automatically carried on by every animal organism, so are the wants of civilized men which this labor is occupied in satisfying an extension and elaboration of the simple needs of our sub-human ancestors, and as these wants attain different degrees of development so also must the organization of labor required to supply the demand thereby called forth for the particular commodities or services wanted attain different degrees of development.

Between the point in the development of a want where it can be fully satisfied or even where it can only be fully satisfied by one's unaided bodily organs to the point where an elaborate and centralized organization of labor becomes necessary to most economically and satisfactorily supply the particular commodity or service wanted there are many stages. Hence the determination of the question whether any given field of economic effort is fit or can be fit for social and collective administration must in chief

measure depend upon the degree of development that has been reached or that under the conditions of the case and the state of the arts can alone be reached in the methods and the organization of production in the particular industry and upon the position which the industry occupies in relation to other industries.

Bearing in mind the fact, that production, considered as a distinct form of human activity becomes differentiated from human activities in general, including the activities involved in consumption, by a slow process of evolution, and that all the time the appearance of new wants and their development to the point where they can only be satisfied by distinctly economic action, gives rise in this manner to new occupations and industries that only in given instances and usually by slow stages attain that degree of importance and integration or capacity for integration which makes necessary and desirable their social control, it must seem to the thoughtful student of human affairs and it will so seem under the Collectivist State to be quite as unwarrantable and illogical to arbitrarily prohibit *all* private economic transactions, all services performed by one individual for another for an economic consideration, as it would to prohibit the individual from performing for himself such operations, as, for example, the repairing of clothes, shaving, hair dressing, shoe polishing, etc., which the individual now sometimes performs for himself when he requires it done and sometimes for a stipulated compensation delegates to another.

The primary object of Socialism is the abolition of exploitation, the exploitation of the laborer by the capitalist and of the consumer by the producer or those controlling production. In order to eliminate the former of these two methods of exploitation, society must assume the function of the capitalist, the function of ownership and accumulation of the capital required to productively employ the labor of the people, the function of ownership of the land and the machinery of production. By thus rendering the laborer independent of the capitalist, by thus guaranteeing to the laborer employment and the means of employment, capitalistic exploitation of labor becomes impossible and the capitalist class ceases to exist.

But a state of things is conceivable and might under certain conditions of industry be desirable in which collective ownership of capital might be accompanied with the private use thereof. Where the methods of production and communication are but little developed, and where all industrial undertakings are in consequence necessarily carried on on a small scale and by a large number of independent and competing establishments, economic justice might be fully secured by guaranteeing to all equal rights

and opportunities to the soil and to the use of the implements of industry while leaving the administration of industry as a private function in the hands of the people as individuals and in their capacity of private citizens.

Under such an arrangement of things the exploitation of the laborer by the capitalist or landowner would indeed be impossible, nevertheless such a system is not adapted for the conditions of modern industrial society. Modern methods of transportation and communication and the marvelous technical development that has taken place within recent periods both in the field of extractive and manufacturing industries have made it necessary that in such industries and in others that are connected with and dependent upon these, labor to be most effective should be consolidated and operated under a unified management.

The progress of events in the industrial world affords convincing proof that consolidation to the point of monopoly is the normal, inevitable and logical outcome of industrial evolution and that there is, therefore, no choice but between a system of private monopoly for the benefit of the private monopolists, whether the latter be few or many, and one of public monopoly for the benefit of all. Competition in so far as it is still possible, is, in most instances, merely a waste of human labor and of resources of nature and society, the cost of which must be borne by all.

The interests of the people, as consumers, therefore, demand that society, in its corporate capacity, shall assume not merely the passive function of ownership of the land and capital but also the active function of administration of all such industries as the technical development of the age has converted into what we may properly denominate as natural monopolies, using the term to include all those industries which can more economically and productively be carried on under unified than under separate management.

In so far, however, as no advantage can be derived by the consumer from the performance of any particular industrial function by communal action there can be no reason why such function should be so performed. Private production in itself and under conditions where it can involve no exploitation is no evil any more than is private consumption, and as the object of production is consumption, that is to say, the satisfaction of the desires of the individual, it is but reasonable to suppose that unless artificially restrained the form of production will in many instances and with advantage ever coincide with or closely approach the form of consumption. As it is the needs of the consumer which set in motion the efforts of the producer then it would be a gratuitous injury and wrong to the former if when

his requirements are of such a nature as can best be satisfied or as can only be satisfied by individuals working independently, the voluntary performance of such services were prevented by the coercive power of governmental authority.

It is unfortunate that in the reaction from the present economic chaos some Socialists should have been carried into the advocacy of the opposite and almost equally undesirable extreme of universal and compulsory centralization of all economic power under collective control, the doctrine that every individual, whatever his occupation, and whether he be a farmer or a bishop, a tailor or a magazine editor, a barber or a novelist, must be a public employé drawing his salary from the national treasury and subject to the orders of some superior official or administrative committee.

As we have seen, however, the protection of the producers or laborers from capitalistic exploitation, does not in itself require the taking over by the community of a single economic function except that of banking and landowning, and that the real justification for the socialization of any industry or form of service is that the interests of the people as consumers can best be promoted thereby.

The co-operation of all for all in the production and distribution of the objects that minister to the ordinary material needs of life is without doubt a superior and more effective method of satisfying the economic wants of the people than the system of private and competitive or private and monopolistic production affords, but it can easily be shown that in certain branches of economic effort more satisfactory services could be obtained by the consumer from private individuals or associations than from the collective body of society consciously organized for such economic purposes.

Will any one seriously maintain, for example, that a government department or bureau would be as successful in catering to the diverse religious needs of the population as the present independent and specialized armies of priests and clergymen of the various denominations, including Christian Science readers and healers, Spiritualistic mediums, Mormon apostles, Dowieite missionaries, Salvation Army street exhorters, Theosophical adepts, Ethical Culture lecturers, etc., etc., together with the constantly arising new prophets and founders of religions who, by their very success in making converts, prove their fitness for partaking in the task of supplying the demand for religious ministration?

Or again, would it be carrying to an unreasonable extreme the principle that religion is properly a private matter to question the wisdom of a policy of State administration of theological seminaries and to condemn the establishment of a government mo-

nopoly in the training of students for the ministry? Would it not, on the contrary, be clearly a backward step in historical development, an atavistic return to a more primitive social stage to thus bind together church and state by amalgamating their functions?

Or to take an example from another field of economic effort, let us ask ourselves how the benefits of a multiform free press, representing all shades of public opinion and every sect, school, organization and interest, political, industrial, religious, scientific, literary, artistic, local and miscellaneous, dealing with all manner of topics and freely commenting from all points of view upon men and events; admonishing, guiding and influencing the actions of individuals, organizations and governments; the bulwark of democracy, the champion of popular rights and without which government must inevitably relapse into a despotism; let us ask ourselves how the advantages of this great and beneficent modern institution could be retained by the people if journalism in all its forms is itself to become a department of the government and if editors are to be the appointees of the very officials or bodies whose actions and policies they are to review.

It is plain, therefore, that there must be some exceptions to the rule that every economic function shall be socialized and that all capital shall be held in common. Just as Socialists of all schools agree that municipalities and other local bodies should share with the central government in the control of industry, on the ground that the municipal administration of enterprises of a local nature would be for the best interest of the municipalities concerned, so should it logically be also conceded that occupations of an individualistic nature, that is, occupations that must naturally be carried on by individuals or even, in some cases, by groups of individuals working by themselves, should be carried on by them as private undertakings for themselves. As there is a proper sphere of economic activity for society as a whole and another also for municipalities and local government bodies, so likewise should it be recognized is there a proper field for the independent economic activity of private individuals.

The precise bounds of the economic sphere that must be thus reserved wholly or in part for private effort can not of course be definitely outlined. The question whether any given industry at any given stage of its development shall be considered as lying within the proper field of collective administration, must in each case be decided on its own merits. It does not follow, however, that even within the economic area at any time embraced by collective action the field must be entirely closed to private individuals, that is to say, by means of legislation.

If, notwithstanding the possession of the advantage of unlimited capital upon which no interest or profits need be earned, and

of having by the right of eminent domain the use of the best points of natural productivity for which no rent need be paid, the State as producer can not so satisfy the requirements of the consuming public as to displace by mere superiority of service and not by the exercise of political authority all private production within a given industry, then to the extent that private production thus succeeds in maintaining itself it thereby demonstrates its superiority for such forms of economic activity over the method of collective or socialized production and should therefore, if only in the interest of the consumer, be permitted to retain free of legislative interference its occupancy of such portions of the economic domain.

The common or joint rights of all in the natural and social means of production must no doubt in diverse instances require and justify restriction of the private use of such means of production. Such restriction, however, while fatally handicapping private industry for the larger part, should not be imposed as the act of a hostile government, seeking by the arbitrary exercise of its legislative power to stifle private competition, but should come only as part of the necessary communal administrative duties and in the exercise of just and impartial communal property rights in the communal property.

But now, if the prohibition of private competition, *per se*, where the latter is possible, is undesirable, and if where competition is impossible legislation is unnecessary, then it follows that practically no legislative action on the matter would really be required at all, and that there would need to be almost no interference whatever under Socialism with the industrial liberty of the individual. Given public ownership of the natural resources and of as large a fund of capital as is required to most fully and productively employ the labor power of the people, then exploitation of man by man being thus rendered impossible, labor will flow towards the collective or individualist form, as either is most profitable to itself and the community.

Of course, the recognition of the right of individual liberty in production, subject to the ownership by the whole of society in the major portion of the means of production, must be coupled with a recognition of the right of individual liberty in consumption, and such individual liberty in consumption must include not only the liberty of demand and the right to have the demand supplied in the case of objects produced or that may be produced by collective agency, but also the right to avail one's self by means of a universally accepted medium of exchange and token of value of the services voluntarily offered by private individuals, and to use such medium of exchange for any other purpose or transaction of a private character not opposed to the public welfare.

When money will have lost the power to breed money, that is, when interest on capital will have fallen to zero, and surplus profits will have become impossible, as a result of the socialization of as large a portion of the field of industry as would be required to absorb all the labor seeking employment free of exploitation and supply in full the public demand for goods and services at cost; then, as the mere accumulation of money by a private individual beyond an amount reasonably required for purposes of consumption would no longer avail as now to bring in a revenue of itself, or, rather, out of the labor of others, all such private accumulations, representing, as they would then, the product of the labor and abstinence of the owners, would be as socially harmless as they would be unusual.

The objection will perhaps be made to this that the liberty to accumulate capital which may be used for private purposes must give it an income bearing power when employed at least within the economic domain reserved for private enterprise, for example, when employed as the plant of a college of phrenology, or, say, of a magazine devoted to the advocacy of the doctrine of reincarnation, and that, therefore, nothing less than the absolute prohibition of all gainful private economic activities and of all private property in objects available for productive and money making purposes will suffice to permanently and completely eliminate the possibility of the recurrence under one form or another, of the evil of usury or capitalistic increase.

To this, the reply that must be made is, that where the income that might be thus derived from private sources would exceed the value of the labor expended, manual and intellectual, and include the equivalent of what would now be called the interest upon the capital, then the fact that capital could thus command interest would indicate that society had been remiss in the performance of one of its necessary economic functions, namely, that of supplying *at cost* and free of interest the capital required by the people for their private use, where such private use could not detrimentally affect the capital in public use. Private capital could not command interest in the presence of a fund of public capital sufficiently large to supply the full private demand and available to all under such terms and regulations as would merely secure its maintenance and replacement. In the absence of an exploiting class to abstract from labor the larger part of its product, the earning power of the citizens mutually guaranteed, would afford a perfectly safe and ample basis of credit upon which to secure all loans that might be required by them for private purposes, industrial or otherwise.

Thus there is no reason to fear that the liberty of individuals under Socialism to remain outside the bounds of the collective or-

ganization of labor, in those isolated instances where such a proceeding would be profitable to them, would be attended with evil consequences to the remainder of the community. On the contrary, in making it optional with the individual whether he shall avail himself of the advantages of associative labor, trusting to the coercion of self-interest rather than of political authority to force men into the necessary state of economic integration required by the development of production, and in providing an opportunity for the eccentric and unruly as well as for those who really have a service to perform for the community or any portion thereof which society has failed or can not undertake to perform for itself; in providing an opportunity for all such to seek if they will economic autonomy, much will be gained in the lessening of social friction and the avoiding of a spirit of discontent.

The changes passed through by the social organism in its development from a lower to a higher type, like the changes passed through by the animal organism in the development of a new species, follow the law of least effort and leave outstanding and transmuted as little as the new conditions allow, all organs and functions appropriate to the preceding type. This parsimony of nature's efforts at progress is very strikingly illustrated in the survival in higher forms of life, individual and social, by inheritance from long extinct lower forms, of organs and rudiments of organs which under the new conditions of existence of the species or society, have become not only completely useless but even positively harmful, as in the case of the appendix vermiform in the human body and of the effete and parasitical ecclesiastical organizations in the body politic. Now, as society is an organism, the evolution of which must follow the connected and orderly method of natural law, we can not expect, judging from analogy, that the change from the capitalistic to the collectivist economy and from competition to co-operation will involve so tremendous a break with the past as to result in the complete disappearance and exclusion from all departments of the economic life of the nation of that principle of private effort which to-day is almost the sole form of economic activity.

Just as the coming of Socialism and in a remote future of an all-embracing Communism is foreshadowed in the Socialistic and Communistic institutions already prevailing and which color present day capitalistic society, as for example, the institution of a nationally owned and nationally operated postal department, of public schools, government lighthouses and life-saving stations, national and municipal parks, etc., so must there be a survival of certain phases of the modern individualistic economy in the midst of collectivism.

The matter assumes, however, a very different aspect, if we

ask ourselves whether these survivals of individualism are likely to continue throughout all future stages of social development.

When we measure the progress that has been achieved by man, since the time, ten thousand years ago, when by the banks of the Euphrates and the Nile, he first awoke from the racial sleep of savagery; when we remember that the period which has since elapsed is but as a moment compared to the ages during which the earth has been in a habitable state, though inhabited only by our kindred of lowliest forms, and but as a moment compared to the ages that are still to pass during which it will continue to provide a home for the countless generations of our successors and descendants; and when we reflect that the forward and upward movement of progress must continue in the future with a never-diminishing and ever-accelerating speed as man rises to the consciousness and the dignity of his position as master of nature, sovereign and supreme on a planetic domain; we are overcome by the conviction that, in the course of this progress, political, economic, ethical and intellectual, our race will cast away, one by one, the institutional swaddling clothes of its infancy, and arrive at last at that exalted and divine social and ethical condition in which there shall be neither money nor private property, whether in objects of production or of consumption, and in which men shall nobly live and faithfully labor without constraint or authority and without a thought of emolument or wage; a social and ethical condition which shall bind every man in love to live for all and in liberty to serve all, every man finding the reward of his labor in the common gain and in the joy of his work the only incentive.

Raphael Buck.

Kautsky on the Trade Crisis.



WHATEVER may be thought of Kautsky's political tactics, with which it may as well be said the writer of this is in complete disagreement, it must be admitted ungrudgingly that he is far and away the best economist in the Socialist movement at the present time. His ability has never been more clearly shown than in the remarkable series of articles which he has recently published in the "Neue Zeit" under the title of "Krisentheorien" (Theories of the Trade Crisis).

The immediate reason for the production of these articles is the industrial crisis which has been showing itself in Germany and is still depressing trade in that country. A certain Russian professor, M. v. Tugan Baronowsky, has published a new work upon the subject of "English Crises," and this work is made by Kautsky the peg upon which to hang his argument.

Kautsky speaks in high general praise of the book. He calls the author a "Revisionist"—that is, a modified Marxist, and recommends him as a patient student and one who spends his time seeking to acquire positive scientific information, rather than in mere destructive criticism.

According to Kautsky, Tugan is a supporter of the Marxian theory of value, but an opponent of the theory of surplus value. He bases his opposition to the surplus-value theory upon what he calls the tendency of the rate of profit to fall.

It is well known that the capitalistic method of production has a tendency to increase the quantity of constant capital (machinery, buildings, etc.) more and more in comparison with variable capital (wages). Technical advance and competition bring it about that the former increases continually, the mass of raw stuffs which are turned into commodities becomes larger and larger, while at the same time the number of workmen employed by no means increases proportionately. From this the conclusion is drawn by Marx that the profit-rate has a falling tendency.

Tugan disagrees with this conclusion, and says:

"The substitution of the laborers by the machine must increase the productivity of labor. The labor-value of each particular portion of the product must sink. But since all products sink in value the value of constant capital must also go down with them.

* * * * A true explanation of the problem is therefore by no means as simple as Marx assumes."

Tugan's fundamental mistake in this line of argument is, as Kautsky cleverly points out, his failure to separate the individual endeavor from the social process—he mixes the known trade-

object of the individual capitalist with the unknown effects of his acts upon society. Therefore he makes merry over the Marxian profit theory in the following language:

"Machines, the mightiest weapon of the manufacturers in their fight against the working-classes, appear, according to this theory, the most dangerous enemy of the capitalists themselves. Until this secret in the theory of Marx is explained the manufacturer cannot achieve the downfall of his own class by the displacement of the laborer by the machine."

"As if," says Kautsky, "manufacturers were aware of the social consequences of their acts!" That manufacturers are interested in the raising of the profit-rate, and that in their hunt for technical improvement they lower the profit-rate, is not more contradictory than the fact that they are interested in high prices for their wares and by technical improvements work their hardest to pull these prices down, or than in the fact that they are particularly interested in an increase in consumption and yet do their utmost to keep wages down. If what manufacturers work for and what they achieve were identical, then there would have been no crisis, and Tugan would not have needed to write his book. What is the use of economic knowledge if the best guide is the manufacturing expert?

Kautsky shows that there is an increase of profit as a result of an increase in the amount of constant capital, but this only holds good as long as the means of production so improved remains the private property of a single individual capitalist, that is, as long as the increased productivity of labor has no influence upon the price of the commodity produced by him. So long as this price remains the same as it did under the earlier and less developed powers of production, so long the capitalist gains an extra profit, and hence an enhanced profit-rate.

However, this extra profit induces other capitalists to use the improved means of production, and the rate of profit drops. The individual capitalist would undoubtedly be a fool to lay out capital with the purpose of diminishing his rate of profit, but this is the necessary consequence of his innovations, a consequence which develops without any conscious action on his part and against his will.

Each capitalistic entrepreneur is compelled to get his profits just as much from the constant, according to the Marxian terminology, as from the variable part of his capital. The capitalist contends, and in this matter finds himself in complete accord with the bourgeois economists.

"Here," says Kautsky, "we get the upshot of all this revision of the surplus-value theory by one of the cleverest and deepest of the revisionists."

The result of the attack upon the Marxian theory simply leads the attackers back to the bourgeois economists.

Kautsky says of the explanation of the crisis, as caused by over-production, which is the commonplace solution, that it brings the problem no further under our control, in face of the glaringly obvious extremes of wealth and poverty. By over-production is meant production beyond the needs of the market, but this is only relative, for the needs of the market are very elastic, expanding to-day and contracting to-morrow, so that it is impossible to predicate anything certainly of them under a system of happy-go-lucky individual production.

Under-consumption on the part of the proletariat has been seen from the beginning of capitalist production to have been the cause of crises; Robert Owen and Sismondi both assigning it as such. Marx and Engels also see it as the final cause, but not the immediate reason of them. Engels shows that under-consumption cannot be the sole cause, for crises are only about one hundred years old, while under-consumption is as old as the antagonism of the classes of the robbers and the robbed, and goes beyond the limits of recorded history.

He sums up the differences between earlier modes of robbers and modern industrial capital as largely consisting in the fact that in the former under-consumption on the part of the robbed was compensated for by over-consumption on the part of the robbers, for consumption in one form or another kept very close behind production, which was carried on by very slowly improving methods. Under-consumption in pre-capitalistic times is followed by deterioration both of the land and the peasantry, such as occurred in and brought ruin upon ancient Greece, the Rome of the Empire, and feudal France and Spain.

Capitalistic production is quite different from that form of production preceding its advent. It is for the market, and not for the individual, and in the market, everything else being equal, the cheapest wins. It is impossible for the modern capitalist to hold his own in the market if he uses up all that he makes. He must accumulate and increase his capital in order to remain in the ring, so that under-consumption on the part of the laborer is no longer compensated for by over-consumption on the part of the master. In this fact lies the evil consequences following over-production in our present system. The fact is that under existing conditions the market is not sufficiently elastic. Production expands more rapidly than the market. With the opening of new markets we get periods of prosperity, followed shortly afterward by crowding out of the newly-expanded market, and consequent depression and crisis.

Tugan finds the explanation of the crisis in the planlessness of

modern production. General over-production is not necessary; over-production of one staple commodity is sufficient. Kautsky finds much truth in this statement and illustrates it by the textile industry, which reacts upon the iron and other industries.

Agreements between manufacturers to limit production when intended as a remedy fail to meet the case, for the result of such agreements is only interference with free competition, which is the only regulator of the anarchy and confusion prevailing at the present time. On the contrary, the stronger the association of manufacturers for the purpose of limiting over-production, the more accumulated stocks pile up, and thus their very agreement constitutes a new element of crisis.

Under the head of "Change in the Character of the Crisis," Tugan says in the work under consideration: "Many fancy that the crises will be done away with by the growth of trade associations, combinations (for the purpose of regulating production), syndicates, and trusts, since these have all a direct or indirect tendency to limit economic production. We are not inclined to underestimate the significance of such associations, for their universal extension is in our eyes the best proof of the bankruptcy of free competition, and of the necessity of the regulated organization of social production."

He then arrives at the gist of the whole matter—"Limitation of production is as far as the laborer is concerned tantamount to deprivation of work."

With regard to the question of the intensity of the crisis, whether it is milder or more severe than the crisis of fifty years ago, Kautsky declares that in his opinion this is all a matter of the point of view. Associations to limit production have made them milder for the manufacturers, but they are harder upon the laborer. These associations not only make it harder to procure work in times of depression, but they keep wages down in times of prosperity. In times of prosperity the margin is so slight that neither the individual workman nor his association (benefit society) is able to save anything, and so when the period of depression comes furniture and clothes find their way to the pawnbroker's and nothing is left to the laborer but the almshouse or the jail.

Kautsky refers to the effects of a period of depression upon the relations of employer and employed in the following language: "As long as English trade controlled the market, English workmen might convince the capitalist that to live and let live was the best policy. This has come to an end through the competition of Germany and America. Hence the fight against the unions has now begun there, and this fight will grow all the keener with the increase in intensity of the commercial struggle between the

powers. This will drive the English working classes into politics and to a closer affiliation with the proletarians of other countries."

Crisis, conflict and catastrophe of every kind—the future has these in store for us during the next ten years. It is not the crisis alone which lies at the foundation of the struggle between capital and labor, but the growing robbery of the masses with the continually increasing accumulation of capital as a result of that robbery.

Such is a brief examination of the line of argument pursued in Kautsky's articles which, short as they are, still show a greater comprehensiveness of grasp and cogency of reasoning than anything which has yet appeared upon the subject. The shelves are cumbered with books the sum total of which do not enable the reader to comprehend the fundamental and unavoidable causes of the trade crisis with anything like the accuracy and ease which Kautsky's marvelous powers of analysis have placed at our disposal.

AUSTIN LEWIS.

to n
and an
the
and an

A Defense of the Old Law.

Upon the receipt of the August number of the REVIEW, the first article, "Wanted; a New Law of Development," arrested my attention. The very thought that the law of evolution was insufficient was startling. After reading the article it seemed to me that what was wanted—in Jack London's case—was not a new law, but rather a fuller appreciation of the law.

What I may have to say is not intended to be received as coming from an authority, but as one who views the law of development from a different point of view and wishes to point out the differences, and, if possible, to be relieved of any error he may have had in his mind concerning the "Law."

With Jack London, I accept as true the law of development as quoted by him, viz.: "That in the struggle for existence, the strong and fit and the progeny of the strong and fit have a better opportunity for survival than the weak and less fit and the progeny of the weak and less fit."

After having made this statement he goes forward and defines what he conceives to be meant by "strong," and reaches the conclusion that "In this struggle, which is for food and shelter, the weak individuals must obviously win less food and shelter than the strong."

It seems to me that he here reduces the whole of development of man to the plane of animal existence; to a plane where the ultimate goal is food and shelter; to the plane of the muscular or avoirdupois; where the effort is only that stimulated by hunger and exposure; where instinct is the highest guide.

I do not for one moment accept man as an animal—per se—man is all that the animal is, plus his mental and spiritual qualities, and I take it that it is these qualities that make him better and nobler only in proportion as he develops those higher qualities, and that man will never reach his full development until he has arrived at the fullness of all possible development of the mental and the spiritual qualities with which he is endowed; that his upward growth has been along the line of the mental and spiritual in harmony with the law as given; only as he comes to a place of consciousness does he or has he really made any real progress. It is a certain stage of consciousness that is now being reached that is the mighty propelling force that is about to usher in the new era that will give to humanity economic freedom, that is rallying under the banner of Socialism, but as the economic question is the one which is the next in order for settlement, it does not necessarily follow that that would be man's final goal of development:

it only settles the grosser material question and makes possible man's freedom from the domination of the animal and opens freely the door to the development of those qualities in man which are the distinguishing characteristic differences between him and the animal. It has been these higher qualities in man that have raised him from his lowest estate to his present plane, and which are his element of strength, rather than his physical prowess.

If this were not so, then the man with the club—the master, being the strong (physically), he and his progeny would have remained in power to this day, wielding the same club—physical force—in the same manner as of yore.

The thought that the law applies to physical strength is what he bases his article on; his final conclusions are based on the same idea; yet in the body of his essay he gives what are, to me, results that have come about in spite of mere physical force. If the master held his place because he was strong and fit and his progeny were also the most fitted to survive, how comes it that the slave and the progeny of the slave, the unfit (?) has changed his relation from that of slave (the chattel) to serf, to wage-earner? This very fact carries with it the refutation that it is the strong in a physical sense only that survive, and at the same time it proves that there was some power, some strength, that raised the slave from that of a chattel to that of serf, and whatever the source of strength, it was greater than that form held by the master.

If there is any one thing that a review of man's development does show it is that the growth of man has always been from below upward, never has that been reversed, and it was only after facts sufficient had been gathered to see that there was an inevitable direction which mankind had always pursued under many varying forms, that it became possible to formulate the law. It was not possible to arrive at this law until there were data sufficient from which could be deduced the law. There was no new law invented, it was simply our development in other than a physical sense that made the recognition of it possible. That once recognized, the theory of social growth changed from the field of speculation to the domain of science.

This is the true reason why all the philosophies of all the philosophers prior to the time that there had been sufficient data to draw conclusions from were, necessarily, incomplete and necessarily Utopian.

While all the earlier philosophies were short of a complete recognition of the law, yet each added something that was true and eliminated something that was false as held by his predecessors. So on the material plane, each movement upward was a growth which had all the strength of previous movements plus what it may have developed and made manifest.

Every movement forward was a movement that gave evidence that strength was something more than physical force, and while each step was made and demonstrated a superior power on the physical and material plane, it yet demonstrated that the individual as such was less important than he had been. The proof of this is in the fact that individuals combined and used a collective power as such, rather than a mere individual personal force.

It is true that man began to rise by using his personality as seemed to him best, and while his efforts and his successes in the upward climb were made under the idea of antagonism to his neighbor, to tribe, to nation, he was as yet not developed to the place where he recognized clearly the value, the strength, of collectivism which he employed; hence, while holding the idea of the importance of the individual, he attributed much of his success to particular men who occupied positions that gave direction to the collective effort. Out of this grew hero-worship, more particularly that which was manifested on the field of battle, and which has so largely made so-called history an account of the exploits of generals and placed them high in the minds of men, rather than regarding them as mere incidents and the expression of the collective thought of the time made manifest through them.

The same thought of individual right held on the purely economic field as to the right of the fruits of labor, the individual learned to combine his efforts with other individuals and to appropriate to himself an undue share of the collective labor. This misappropriation has gone on to this hour, but there has also grown with it in the minds of men an ever-increasing demand for better conditions, until to-day the world stands in about this condition. All our governments recognize a divine right in the rulers to rule. The idea of the "Divine right of Kings" has not yet been eliminated. It has changed form, but the essence of it still remains. To-day in this so-called land of freedom, all the power that ever rested in any king is now represented in "The Almighty Dollar," and not until humanity reaches a place where it is *conscious* of its idolatry, will it or can it be free. We must cease to worship the king, not only in the individual, but in its modern representative, the dollar.

With the growth of man from the individual through tribe, and clan, to nation has been a sense of antagonism. This has grown until to-day all the nations of the earth are in a state of preparedness to resent encroachments on their so-called "rights." The collective social growth has been so great that in reality there are now no territorial bounds that separate one people from another. That the antagonisms have grown to such a degree that they are destructive of the antagonistic system, is beginning to dawn on the minds of those who direct it and are its representatives,

as shown in peace conferences, international courts of arbitration, schemes for disarmament, etc. Thus we have a paradoxical condition in the fact that, while we have grown on the industrial and material plane to a wonderful degree by the natural and evolutionary growth of the *collective* tool in ability to produce those things which make for the betterment of life, we at the same time permit the ownership and control to be from an *individual* basis, because we have not yet, as a people, become free from the belief in the "Divine right of the King." The rule of the strong we yet believe to be in the individual, while we have actually outgrown it in fact.

It is the recognition of this paradoxical condition which distinguishes the Socialist from the individualist, and when clearly comprehended renders him, on the material plane, what we term "class-conscious," and it is this consciousness that is his strength, it is in harmony with the law. It is this that, as I view it, Jack London is not yet wholly conscious of, and for lack of which induces him to have such a pessimistic outlook when humanity will have succeeded in settling the bread-and-butter question—the economic question.

Upon our growth to a state of *consciousness*, which makes us "strong and fit," we cease to revere the king in any form, to acknowledge the individual, as such, supreme; we cease to think *antagonistically*, we begin to think *altruistically*.

This is the very core of Socialism.

How is it demonstrating itself? Listen: "Workingmen of all countries unite, you have nothing to lose, but your *chains* and a *world* to gain." That is the international watchword; the individual is lost in the collectivity; the antagonistic is superseded by the altruistic. The strength is in the thought. When the thought becomes the international thought it will manifest itself in the breaking of the "*chains*."

It is yet quite a distance economically from the point where the weekly wage of an "Italian pants finisher in Chicago is \$1.31;" where "there are seven people living in one underground kitchen, and a little dead child among them;" where a "man fifty years old, who has worked all his life, is compelled to beg a little money to bury his dead child;" where men are compelled to work as they have been in the anthracite mines for an average of \$1.25 per day to support a family; where women are compelled to enter the store, shop, factory and mine; where children by the thousands are sacrificed to the greed of profit; to a place where the wage system will be abolished, and where there will be economic freedom, where women will be free from drudgery and free to live free lives and to develop such healthy bodies and minds that they can be the mothers of *strong*, healthy progeny that will be "fit to sur-

vive ;" to the place where children, instead of being crushed physically and mentally, will be allowed to exercise their inherent right to grow into true men and women, "strong and fit," as no preceding race has ever seen or dreamed of. It is quite a step and it will be taken as soon as *man* arrives at the point of consciousness of his strength. He is gradually awaking, it is giving him strength, and because he is "strong and fit" will he survive and conquer the profit master and make possible a free life economically, and because of his strength, both physically and mentally, will his progeny be strong and fit to still climb up to higher developments in the mental and spiritual planes to a perfect man—and always in harmony with the law.

No, we do not need a new law.

W. H. Miller.

Canton, Ohio.

The Theological Dogma of a Cause World.

SOCIALISM lays claim to being a science on the ground that it is the philosophy of fact in the field of social economics. The first duty of the Socialist, then, is a faithful and unbiased observation of the facts and factors bearing upon economic and social development. In the matter of classification the Socialist is but following in the footsteps of the philosopher of science, and he who would deny us the right to classify would simply deny the right of having any definite knowledge or rational understanding. Without discrimination or classification there can be no knowledge. All that is known, and the faculty of knowing can be traced back by analysis to a sense of the likenesses and differences of things.

Socialists should take care, however, to draw no line of distinction between the world of causes and the world of effects, for there are no known causes not themselves effects. Just so all known effects, or facts, must necessarily stand as causes to further effects. No more serious blunder could be made than to confound cause and effect in any particular instance, yet between the world of cause and the world of effect sound philosophy can establish no line of distinction.

This is the principal reason why many people (including the writer) are not satisfied with a purely materialistic philosophy. We observe facts in human existence that we cannot satisfactorily recognize as being materialistic in their nature. It appears to some of us that life has a material and a spiritual side. The thoughts, desires, loves, hopes, fears, etc., of human beings we cannot recognize as being material facts. The materialist, of course, sees these facts that I refer to and can understand the distinction that we make. He regards them as being the effects of material causes and lets them go at that. Now the contention that I make here is that if they are effects—if there are such facts—then they must necessarily in turn be causes, and have their effects.

Whether one assumes that existence is wholly materialistic, or wholly spiritualistic, or that it may, perchance, partake of the nature of both, makes no difference in the above argument. If we recognize the existence of the facts—effects—we must recognize them as causes. Otherwise we have assumed a "cause world" as distinguished from the world of effects. We have simply taken the theologian's "cause world" out of the metaphysical skies and buried it in the ground, thereby simply reversing the relation of the "cause world" to the world of effects.

I am not, however, making an argument here for any particular school of ultimate philosophy, except as a means to an end. What I am really contending for is the right to be a Socialist on a question of economics, without being forced to accept a particular view on a question of ultimate philosophy, which might, perchance, happen to appear to me as being unsound and untenable, and without being baptized into a particular theological belief, in which I might, perchance, happen to have no faith. My contention is not that some certain particular view on ultimate assumptions is essential to Socialism, and that materialistic Socialists have assumed the wrong assumption, but that no such assumption is the essential of Socialism. That is, assuming that Socialism is a question of economics, and not a theological bone of contention.

Now "we" Spiritualists have the same horror of things "theological" that "we" Socialists have, and pride ourselves upon our rationalism and scientific method of thought. Your materialistic conception of history carried to the extreme that some Socialists see fit to carry it—apparently thinking the more extreme the more scientific—looks from our point of view very much like assuming a materialistic "cause world." If there is a co-operative commonwealth we shall all be in it, and I for one shall still be disputing with you these questions of ultimate philosophies. What shall we have to argue about, I should like to know, when the "war" and the state of "trade" no longer furnish a topic? What a fix we should be in, indeed, were we to allow the Socialist—the only Socialist—to settle them at once for all time! Shall we not be discussing questions of philosophy and religion when the towers of the co-operative commonwealth are gray with age? Let us hope. Then *broaden* the skirts of your tents, oh Socialism, in this matter of mere philosophies, and *narrow* down to the matter in hand—social economics.

Z. C. Ferris.

there is good reason to believe that this great battle has in many ways marked the beginning of the end of capitalism in America.

International Socialist Congress.

The International Socialist Bureau has just sent out a notice requesting suggestions for the order of the day at the International Congress to be held in Amsterdam next August. It is to be hoped that some action may be taken to raise the standard of the proceedings of this congress above the level of the last one at least. It must always be with a feeling akin to disgrace that the Socialists of the world will look back upon a gathering of men from all over the world at an expense of thousands of dollars, spending their time discussing a *cas Millerand*. Worst of all, this discussion has settled absolutely nothing, as must necessarily be the case with such discussions. An International Congress is ill fitted to consider questions of local tactics and has no power to enforce its decisions when made. Furthermore, such discussions render its proceedings when published practically valueless save in the country whose problems were particularly discussed, and in most cases they have little effect there.

An International Congress of Socialists is like any other international gathering of specialists, primarily a congress of experts. When an International Congress of criminologists, chemists, or scientists of any other kind meet they do not discuss questions involving the personal relations of its members, but discuss those questions that will add to the knowledge of the branch of thought in which their members are interested. Socialism lends itself especially to such a discussion. There are within the Socialist ranks at the present time a large number of experts upon various economic and sociological questions, and if the order of the day were made up of such topics as Socialism and Trade Unions, Socialism and Criminology, Socialism and Art, Education, Municipal Affairs, the proceedings would constitute a volume which would be absolutely indispensable to every student of economic questions. The Socialist movement has within its membership men who are able to speak with authority upon every one of these subjects, both as Socialists and as specialists in the topic itself. If some Socialist could be selected to prepare a paper in each of these departments, reviewing that subject in the light of Socialist philosophy, and one or two others, also specialists in the same line, selected to open the discussion to be followed by general discussion by all those present, the proceedings would at once gain immensely in value.

By this means the congress would be engaged in a consideration of principles and not the application of these principles to local conditions. The subjects could be considered in a scholarly manner, but free from the partisanship and personality which is bound to intrude into any such discussions as those which occupied the attention of the last congress. When these principles have been thoroughly worked out they could be made the basis of local action and could be discussed in their local application only in those places where the questions of application were the mooted ones.

Some of these points were discussed by Comrade H. M. Hyndman in one of our recent issues, and he also called attention to another point of importance in this same connection, and that is the need of taking some action to make the work of the International Bureau somewhat more effective. It should be said, however, in justice to the comrades who are at present conducting the work of the bureau that the parties of the various countries have by no means accorded them the support to which they were entitled. A large number of national parties are still delinquent in the small dues which were pledged to the international organization at the Paris congress. Again, it must be remembered that the difficulties incident to the installation of the necessary machinery of an international organization, however simple that machinery may be, is great. Several of the countries have been slow to elect their delegates to the international council. There seems to have been no attempt to keep up the system of international bulletins on any efficient scale, and in general there has been great looseness and lack of interest.

At the same time the Belgian comrades have been engaged most intensely in their local affairs, and this has tended to weaken the work of the local bureau.

These are all defects that time, tact and experience can remedy, and by the time the Amsterdam congress meets a practicable plan of avoiding the most of these difficulties should have been evolved, and steps can then be taken toward the more systematic and effective co-ordination of international effort than has been hitherto possible.

One of the things which should be done by the bureau before the meeting of the next congress is to prepare an exhaustive report giving the exact strength of the Socialist parties in the various countries, a statement of the particular problems upon which they are engaged, the methods of party organization and the outlook for the immediate future. Such a report would prove one of the most valuable historic documents ever issued, while it would also be of great propaganda and educative value at the present time.

This number goes to press some days before election, and hence we can say nothing as to the Socialist strength save that the vote is certain to show a very great increase over that of 1900. In our next number, however, we shall seek to give complete tabulated comparative results for the whole country, and would ask the co-operation of our readers to this end. After the votes are counted, send us the result on a postal card, together with the vote for Debs and Harriman in 1900.

Our table of contents contained two rather confusing errors last month. The article, "Kautsky on Trade Crises," was announced, while it did not appear, having been crowded out after the first "make-up." The second was when the editorial, "A Discordant Note," was ascribed to Ernest Untermann. All matter appearing in this department is written by A. M. Simons, unless signed by some one else.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

France.

The twentieth national convention of the Parti Ouvrier Français, held at Issoudun on Sept. 21, unanimously condemned the anticlerical brutalities of the liberal government and adopted a resolution declaring them simply "a new trick of the capitalist class for the purpose of drawing the attention of the working class away from the fight against wage slavery. . . . Economic emancipation must precede religious emancipation." The same government that persecutes the religious orders at home voted millions to reimburse them for their losses in China and sent an armed force to the far East for the purpose of convincing the Chinese that the priests have a divine mission to fulfill.

The delegates of the Parti Ouvrier met a few days later, on the 26th to 28th of September, with the delegates of the other factions of the Unite Revolutionaire at Commentry (Allier). It will be remembered that this unity had been formed at Ivry in November, 1901, and a transition program adopted which should make the final amalgamation of the revolutionary elements, as opposed to the ministerialists (Jauresistes), possible. The main purpose of the convention was the perfection of a solid organization. The representation, apportioned on the basis of one delegate to each 5,000 members, consisted of 186 delegates, of which the Parti Ouvrier held the majority.

Thanks to the judicious methods of the central committee and to the good will of the comrades in all parts of the country, the steps toward the final consummation of a united revolutionary party were quickly made. Among the thirty-four federations of the party there were twenty that existed before the Ivry convention and belonged only to one single organization; fourteen of them belonged to the Parti Ouvrier in the departments of Ain, Alpes, Aube, Dordogne, Drome et Ardeche, Gironde, Isere, Loire, Lozere, Marne, Nord, Pas de Calais, Basses-Pyrenees and Pyrenees Orientales; three belonged to the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire in the departments of Cher, Correze, and Indre-et-Loire; and three were autonomous in the departments of Lot, Haut-Rhine, Deux-Sevres, and Vendee. The amalgamation of these caused no difficulty. But there was some delay in perfecting arrangements in those departments where two federations belonging to different organizations existed. This was the case in the departments of Allier, Gard, Haute-Garonne, Rhone and Var, where Guesdiste and Blanquiste federations existed side by side; in the department of Seine-et-Oise, where Guesdiste

and autonomous groups worked simultaneously; and in the departments of Indre, Oise and Seine, where all three factions were represented. However, within three months after the Ivry convention things worked smoothly. Only in Lyon (Rhône) a split has again taken place and remains to be settled. No definite data concerning membership and other organization points have been published so far. A rough estimate gives about 1,200 groups with a membership of 23,000 to 24,000. A table of votes by departments in which departments with less than 1,000 votes are omitted, gives the party 351,144 votes in the last general elections. The names of the fifteen representatives in the *Chambre des Deputes* were given in our issue of July, 1902. The party press consists of eighteen weeklies and the "Bulletin Officiel" of the central committee. Resolutions were adopted regulating the tactics in election campaigns and declaring for independent political action.

The coal miners have declared a general strike, many districts walking out without awaiting the decision of the national committee. Of 47,000 miners in the Pas de Calais, 36,000 quit work before the central committee had announced its decision.

The first rumors of a general strike were heard in the beginning of 1901 during the high tide of prosperity in coal mining, when the miners of Montceau-les-Mines walked out. Three conventions in Lens, Allais and Commentry each declared in favor of a general strike during the course of the succeeding period. The following demands were to be enforced: A legal eight-hour day; 2 francs of old-age pension after 50 years of age and thirty years of employment, and a minimum wage. These demands could not be enforced, because the strike in Montceau-les-Mines was lost, before the referendum on the general strike was taken. But the threat of an impending general strike sufficed to pass the eight-hour law in the *Chambre des Deputes*. This success gave a fresh impetus to the convention of Allais, which voted the general strike with 124 against 105 votes. No action was taken, because the preparations for the general strike had not been completed. But the convention of Commentry finally made the general strike a fact.

The immediate cause of this step is a reduction of wages in the Pas de Calais and in the Loire district, after a short period of increased wages. In 1900, the total wages of all miners, including a total increase of 21,852,000 francs, amounted to 215,878,000 francs, or a yearly wage of 1,333 francs, or an average daily wage of 4.66 francs per miner. This constituted an increase of 28 centimes (5.6 cents) per day over the former wage. In some districts there was a further increase, in others a reduction took place. The dividends of the companies have been enormous, and although there was no sign of their being threatened, a new reduction of wages was lately announced. A committee of the miners protesting against the reduction received a similarly conceited reply as the American miners did. Troops were at once sent into the strike districts. The strikers have posted the following proclamation: "Sons of the people! Remember the recent occurrences in the Bretagne. Remember the attitude of Colonel de Saint-Remy, who refused to obey the orders of his superiors that were opposed to the dictates of his conscience. Soldiers! If you meet us, who are unarmed, with your rifles and bayonets, remember that you may meet the same fate

to-morrow, after your return to the ranks of the civilians. Miners! Do not provoke the soldiers. Remember that we are all brothers and that we have been soldiers the same as they! Hurrah for the emancipation of the proletariat!" Another proclamation, addressed to the miners of all countries, reads as follows: "Comrades of Belgium, England, Germany, Austria, the United States and all other countries! The cause for which the miners of France are fighting is also your cause. The purpose of our fight which we, forced to extremities, have begun, is to ameliorate our desperate condition, to obtain a more just and equitable wage, a better adjustment of hours for the present, and legislation securing us against want in old age. It would be superfluous to dictate to you what to do, for you will know yourself how to act. Counting on your support, we leave it to you to take the necessary steps to help us in this fight. Hurrah for the International Union of Miners!"

No one wishes the miners success so sincerely as the Socialists. But we cannot help regretting the shortsighted policy that imposes untold sacrifices on men with insufficient wages for the purpose of wresting those petty and insecure concessions from the bosses, when a unanimous vote for Socialism would suffice to give them all they produce and emancipate them forever from wage slavery. We cannot help pointing with disapproval to the tactical mistake of refusing to reinforce the economic pressure on the bosses by a sympathetic strike out of reverence for an enforced contract which the bosses have always broken when it suited them. And we cannot help shrugging our shoulders over the simplicity of appealing to the international solidarity of the miners and remaining blind to the international solidarity of all workingmen in a Socialist party. How long will working men prefer to wage the unequal struggle on the economic field instead of ending all strikes forever by a strike at the ballot box?

In the meantime, Prime Minister Combes is copying Teddy the Strenuous in the popular character, "Friend of Labor." He has already received the regulation affront by the coal barons in his attempts at mediation. The "dignity" of his office, so conveniently ruffled and slighted on the eve of the general elections, will have to be vindicated by a popular verdict at the polls. The settlement of the strike by an arbitration committee appointed by Combes will be the next number on the program, and the radical party will extol Combes as the settler of the strike and make political hay while the conciliation sun shines. In the final act, Capital and Labor, hand in hand, will appear in the lime light, and the background scenery will represent the "triumph of arbitration"—republican Teddy, republican Hanna, and democrat Saint Baer, patting the shoulders of the giant Labor and leading him back to the full dinner pail. The vulture of Capital will continue to eat away the liver of Prometheus Labor in perfect friendship, all for the benefit of Labor.

The death of Zola has deprived France of one of its greatest sons. An inspired poet, a fighter for truth, and a prophet of freedom, he had gradually approached the Socialist position and would, perhaps, have found his way into our ranks, had he been spared. His funeral was attended by a hundred thousand friends. Jacques Anatole France,

Colonel Picquart, and Alfred Dreyfuss were present, and the Belgian comrades had sent the deputies Demblon and Fournemont as delegates. Zola will rank in the minds of the coming generations by the side of Dumas and Rousseau, when the bigots of the "Academy" will long be forgotten.

Switzerland.

Some of our friends who have such an exalted opinion of the value of direct legislation as an aid in the proletarian class struggle, will find food for reflection in the following report. At the first meeting of the new cantonal council, to which, in spite of the fervent prayer of the divinely appointed Swiss Baers, twenty-seven Socialists were elected, the president of the council, a dyed-in-the-wool bourgeois, felt his fine-strung soul stung by some remarks of the Socialists. He arose in righteous wrath and delivered himself of a thundering speech against the disreputable enemies of law and order. And when a Socialist speaker, who took the floor in a vigorous rebuttal, was cheered by the people in the galleries, the president sent twenty policemen among the free men of the most democratic republic in the world. The "Volksrecht" says in a biting comment: "The next step will probably be the use of police on the floor of the council to keep the tongues of unruly speakers in check."

The employes of the government-owned railway in Zurich received still a warmer dose of Swiss democracy. During the passage of the King of Italy through Zurich on his way to Germany it was feared that some Italians would try to approach him in the uniform of railway employes. The federal attorney simply ordered the imprisonment of the entire railway force in their offices and baggage rooms. Most instructive of all was the general strike of the street railway employes in Geneva. When the movement became general, the cantonal "radical" council called out the militia and expelled hundreds of "agitators" from the state. It is hinted that anarchist and conservative politicians were the instigators of the strike for the purpose of creating a public sentiment against the radical administration in favor of a still more reactionary government. The militia refused to fire on the strikers, but as the scabs were protected, the strike was lost. Twenty years of direct legislation have not been able to educate the proletariat to an understanding of the class struggle. Direct legislation is all right, in the hands of class conscious workingmen. See?

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The great struggle in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania is over. After weeks of conferences between politicians, capitalists and officials of the strikers, it was finally decided that a commission should be appointed to investigate the mining conditions and make an award at the conclusion of its labors. The miners unanimously resolved to return to work, but they cannot secure their old positions with the same degree of unanimity. Reports from the district state that hundreds of the active unionists have been blacklisted and thousands of others will lose their jobs to the scabs who took their places. This is one of the tragedies of a great battle when organized capital and labor come in deadly conflict on the industrial field. Besides victimizing the brave men who struggled heroically on the industrial field for better conditions, the coal barons do not intend to foot the expense of their attempt to break up the union and enslave the workers more thoroughly than before. Headed by Baer, they have sent word down the line that the price of coal has been advanced 50 cents a ton, so they will probably make good their losses and a handsome profit besides in a very short time. Moreover, the dealers are given to understand that if they follow suit and raise prices "exorbitantly," retail agencies will be established and coal will be sold to the people direct. Thus the little parasites will be forced to be content with their fleecings obtained during the strike. A Boston dispatch also announces that the coal combine is to be reconstructed and made a close corporation like the Standard Oil Octopus, and that the retail dealers will merely "occupy the position of clerks in the new combination." No one will weep any tears for those petty robbers, who surely waxed "prosperous" while the fight was raging. Another significant statement is the one that appeared in the New York organs of the operators immediately following the end of the strike. It was to the effect that mining would be rushed on a gigantic scale just as soon as the properties were placed in condition with a view to accumulating a large enough surplus by the end of next summer to last for several years in case of a further stoppage. This declaration seems to indicate that the mine barons are determined on destroying the workers' organization despite the fact that they were checked this year, temporarily at least. But the manner in which the propaganda for Socialism has been disseminated in Pennsylvania this year may cause the operators a surprise before they are ready to carry their conspiracy into execution. The seed of Socialism has been sown and has taken root, and it is only a matter of a few years at the outside when the old Keystone State will be under the control of the working

class, and then there will be no more armies of coal and iron police and militia and other imported thugs to overawe and bully the honest producers of wealth. All things considered, however, the strike was a victory for the workers, in the double sense of solidifying our ranks, nationally and internationally, without regard to the question of whether we are thoroughly federated, or are "autonomists" or "industrialists," and in demonstrating the correctness of the position of the Socialists, who point out that the class struggle exists and must be met boldly and unitedly.

In a recent issue of the Review it was mentioned that Wall street and the daily newspapers were discussing the enormous capital that had centralized in the hands of J. P. Morgan. It was stated that the great trust monarch controlled no less than \$6,500,000,000 in railway, steamship and industrial stocks and bonds. It was also pointed out that his power was constantly increasing by leaps and bounds, and at the present rate of economic development he would control the entire country in less than a dozen years. Now the news comes from Washington that the Interstate Commerce Commission is about to investigate charges that have been made that Mr. Morgan, who is organizing the Southern railway merger, is gaining possession of immense territory by his cleverness in combining industries. The commission is called upon to inquire whether or not Morgan has obtained control of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, the Louisville and Nashville, the Southern Railway, the Southern Railway in Kentucky, the Southern Railway Company in Indiana, the Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company, the Cincinnati Southern Railway Company, and the Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railroad Company. These roads cover all important railroad points and all railroad lines in a territory aggregating 25,000 miles, with an operating income of over \$30,000,000 annually. They control the commerce of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and Maryland. Their capitalization is stated to amount to at least a billion dollars. They control the business and products of over 16,000,000 people in 422,000 square miles of territory. This octopus will doubtless teach the reactionists and Bourbons of the South a lesson that they will not be able to forget easily, and Morgan's total capital will have increased to \$7,500,000,000. Probably he will bring the grand total up close to eight billion before the end of the year, as it is announced that the great organizer is combining the lighting industries of the various cities. One almost becomes dizzy in contemplating the mighty power wielded by this one man, and if capital continues to centralize under his control as rapidly during the next two years as in the last two the country will be rotten ripe for Socialism about 1904. Those careless Socialists who talk about "Socialism for our children" ought to revise their views and guess again. Socialism is knocking at the door.

That the employers of the country are preparing to make an organized attempt to check the growth and power of trade unions is becoming plainer each day. In a dozen different cities strong local employers' associations exist, and in times of strikes and boycotts they have been a unit in resisting the demands of the workers—in supplying

each other with scabs and money, in swinging the blacklist lash, in hiring and sending spies into unions, in securing injunctions from their servile courts, in having labor laws declared unconstitutional, in instituting damage suits against unions and their members, and in using other methods to defeat labor. At its convention in Indianapolis several months ago the National Association of Manufacturers issued a circular to employers all over the country urging them to "inject business into politics," and aid to destroy or defeat the eight-hour bill in Congress, which was classed as "revolutionary." Now a second circular has been issued, signed by President Parry, inviting manufacturers everywhere to join the association. Mr. Parry again says that the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills in Congress must be killed and asks: "Shall there not be in this country one great, compact organization of diversified manufacturing interests, which shall stand together as a man against the encroachments of organized labor?" He adds that "the time has come in the United States when we have reached the parting of the ways. You are either to have the mastery of your own business or you must turn part of its administration over to your employees." Doubtless Mr. Parry's appeal will have a marked effect, as it is said of him that he is a man of great ability and push in the matter of organization. So well does he stand among the capitalists of the nation that some of the more enthusiastic have started a boom for him as a candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket. Probably now that the organized employers come out boldly into the open and declare that they are going to "inject business into politics," some of those workers who have been crying to "keep politics out of the union" will have another think coming. There is one thing that President Parry and the National Association of Manufacturers can be thanked for, and that is their declaration that a class struggle exists, and that they will protect their interests "against the encroachments of organized labor," and will do it politically, too. That statement disarms the old-style, conservative trade unionist pretty thoroughly.

While the November number of the Review is being printed, the American Federation of Labor convention will be in progress in New Orleans. The situation in the organized labor movement that has developed from the jurisdiction struggle is one of extreme gravity. At the session of the executive council of the Federation in Washington last month the Rubicon was crossed by the "autonomists." They are apparently in control of the council; at least they expelled the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, one of the pioneer organizations of industrialism. As explained in a previous number of the magazine, the "autonomists" and "industrialists" have been at swords' points during the past four years. The former largely constitute the smaller organizations, and those that advocate organization along strictly craft lines, with complete independence or autonomy for each branch of industry, while the industrialists, so-called, favor combining all branches in one organization. The struggle is progressing along about the same lines as the contest between the advocates of state-rights on the one side and those who favored a strong, centralized government during the past two generations in statecraft. In the labor movement, as in national politics, we have had our compromises and decisions that have proven just as

unsatisfactory as the temporizing in ante-bellum days, and affairs are rapidly reaching a climax. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers incident may be the Bull Run in trade union history. The society is a great international organization in every sense of the word. It numbers close to a hundred thousand men, is composed of a dozen merged crafts and has \$2,000,000 in its strong box. It has a beneficial system that is ideal and scientific and its members pay higher dues than nearly all other unions. The "mals," as they are familiarly known, have a method of equalizing their funds, so that the poorest union in point of membership is at once made as strong as the most powerful in financial matters, and local strikers can be supported for an indefinite period. Furthermore, by referendum vote they have decided to assess themselves for the purpose of taking political action along with other unions and Socialist parties in Europe, Australia or America, and at present General Secretary George Barnes, a pronounced Socialist, is a candidate for the British Parliament from a Glasgow district. The reason given for the withdrawal of the charter of the amalgamated engineers is that they refused to yield jurisdiction to the machinists, blacksmiths and patternmakers in trade affairs, to do which would simply have meant their complete effacement on the Western hemisphere. The position taken by the Federation executive council will no doubt tend to settle the jurisdiction controversy, although it may be accompanied by bitter strife for some time, for if the Amalgamated Society of Engineers can be expelled, the brewers, the 'longshoremen, the printers the amalgamated carpenters, the woodworkers and other national bodies, including even the miners, must be treated in the same manner if the council is consistently upheld. That several other national unions are utterly indifferent as to whether they lose their charters or not is generally known. Their national officers are quoted as saying that they will advise their organizations to join the new American Labor Union. However, that is another story, which may be discussed in the future. The attitude of those delegates who are Socialists on the jurisdiction fight will be to stand with the "industrialists" almost to a man. Indeed, the Socialists are accused of having "captured" the Federation conventions before on this particular question, and whether they did or not is immaterial at present. The Socialists are "industrialists" because they have studied the development of capitalist production and know full well that the enemy must be met as a disciplined, compact army, instead of a straggling, heterogeneous, anarchistic mob captained by a lot of quarreling, jealous and egotistical "leaders," whose time is largely taken up not in educating their followers relative to the real principles of trade unionism, but in drawing fine lines of distinction between crafts and preventing harmony and union. As before stated, this jurisdiction question may cause some bitter contention for a few years, especially among swell-headed officers, but the movement will be all the better for it, because the outcome will be the triumph of organization on broad lines, the clearing away of the debris and waste of "autonomy" for every worker who carries a different jack-knife or wears a different necktie, and the toilers will compose a mighty and conquering army that will understand its class interests and fight for them industrially and politically.

BOOK REVIEWS

Social Revolution. Karl Kautsky. Vorwaerts Publishing Company.
Paper, 100 pp., 1.50 mark.

From very many points of view this book is the most important contribution made to Socialist literature in the last decade. It is in one sense the final word on the Bernstein question, although there is not a line in the book that is distinctly controversial nor a reference to the author's noted opponent. He simply sums up the facts that have evolved during the time that this controversy has gone on; these speak so loudly as to absolutely drown the peevish criticisms that have been made of the Socialist philosophy and movement.

The book is divided into two parts; the first is entitled "Social Reform and Social Revolution;" and the second, "The Day After the Social Revolution." He first takes up the idea of social revolution and shows that force or violence is not part of this idea, and that it is distinguished from reform by the fact that revolution implies "the conquest of political power by a new class," while reform applies to changes made without such a transfer of power. Evolution and revolution are then discussed and the danger of biological analogies is pointed out, although it is shown that in the natural sciences the catastrophic theory is by no means abolished. But "the necessity of revolution cannot be determined by biological analogies, but only by the investigation of the facts of social development."

A study of antiquity and the Middle Ages shows that revolution in the sense described could not take place so long as the center of economic and political life was the community and the states were only conglomerates of communities. While this condition existed, peculiarities and individuals predominated over the general, hence uprisings were directed against specific abuses or personalities. There was no recognition of the deeper social relations; the political life was divided into countless small communities and, moreover, the universal practice of carrying arms led to violent uprisings, which, although frequently very bloody, had very small results.

But when we come to the capitalist period things are wholly different. We now have a strong modern state controlled by a governing class and with extensive unified powers, so that the social struggle becomes a struggle for the mastery of the state. Instead of individual movements, we now have the movements of great bodies of the people. Economic evolution is rapid and the science of political economy begins to rise, encouraging a social consciousness and the possibility

of a social goal. All these things tend to make social revolution a natural mode of progress.

The opponents of the revolutionary position claim that class antagonisms are moderating in present society. An examination of the basic economic facts shows that while wages are probably increasing, their rate of increase falls far behind that of capital. Consequently the exploitation of the proletariat is continually increasing. At the same time the proletariat is rapidly rising in its moral and intellectual relations. "The intellectual class is seen not to constitute a buffer class or a new middle class which will prevent class antagonisms; but, on the contrary, is itself rent with a class struggle and tends to aggravate rather than soften class antagonisms." Neither is there any sign of the small bourgeois or the farmers paving the way to a reconciliation of class antagonism as the class struggle rises in their midst as in other classes, and they have long ago cast in their lots with the parties to which their dominant economic interests inclines them. The question then rises as to whether the capitalist class themselves are not becoming more friendly to labor. The fact is that the corporation has almost entirely supplanted the individual employer and wiped out all personal relations, while the trust is more and more bringing the financier to the front, who knows no motive save profits and has no direct connection whatever with the laboring classes. Others claim that democracy offers a promise of a "gradual imperceptible transformation from capitalism to socialism with no violent break with the existing orders, such as the conquest of political powers by the proletariat presupposes." On the contrary, democracy has simply cleared the ground for the battle and offers no means for the avoidance of that battle.

The co-operatives are also offered as an example of a transition state to capitalism. But these are really expropriating only the little merchants and a few small hand trades, such as bakeries, and in no place have as yet affected great capitalists. In consequence they are rather sharpening class antagonisms than otherwise. The unions are of much more importance than the co-operatives for the battle of the laborers; they are actually fighting organizations, and not organizations for "social peace." All of these points are illustrated by numerous examples, especially from English history.

Even the political field is seen to offer no stepping stones to a gradual transition from capitalism to socialism without the necessity of revolution. While in 1847, under the influence of the Chartist movement, the ten-hour day was secured for women and children, in 1900 Millerand was able to carry through only a much more limited ten-hour measure. The eight-hour day was declared by the "International" Congress at Geneva in 1886 to be a preliminary condition to any essential social reform. "Thirty-six years later, at a French Socialist congress in Tours, a delegate declared that the next demand must be for an eight-hour day, and instead of laughing him from the hall, they nominated him for office at the next election in Paris." The disappearance of any strong Parliamentary party has rendered impossible any decisive social reform, while at the same time that Socialists are gain-

ing power in parliaments, parliaments themselves are losing in power and importance.

Concerning the exact nature of the coming revolution, all that can be said of it is that it will be different from all its predecessors. But the great distinguishing factor of the present revolution will be the high organization attained by both contending parties. It will not necessarily be a sudden revolution, but rather a long drawn-out civil war, using the words "civil war" not in the sense of an armed conflict, but in the sense of a continuous fight with a variety of political and social weapons. Among the means which he indicates as possible is the strike, although, of course, he does not share any of the anarchist ideas as to the efficacy of a general strike.

Another force of which he takes note and which has roused the most furious denunciation by the capitalist papers of Germany is the possibility of action by the proletariat during an international war between contending capitalist governments. So far, however, from the proletariat acting as an incentive to such a war, he points out that "the only security for peace at present lies in the fear of the revolutionary proletariat by the capitalist governments."

The second half of the book, which he calls "The Day After the Social Revolution," while extremely suggestive and probably the best thing yet written on the subject, is not quite so successful as the first. Perhaps this is because the description of a future society calls for an imaginative rather than a scientific mind, such as characterizes Kautsky. His discussion of the "expropriation of the expropriators" is extremely ingenious, to say the least, as he suggests the issue of a sort of bonds which will gradually lose their value as the power of exploitation disappears. He admits that this is somewhat in the nature of a deception, but suggests that it may smooth the way.

Another subject, the discussion of which is bound to attract a great deal of attention, is the question of the attraction of the laborers to labor. He points out here the great power of custom and of the discipline which would come from a social organization, the high wages, and the shortening of the hours of labor. He also mentions the attractiveness of labor itself, but does not seem to really catch the full strength of this point, as it has been evolved by the followers of the arts and crafts movement. Some very interesting calculations are given as to the increased productivity of labor in Socialist organizations, showing how great economies can be made by centralization alone. There will be quite a large remnant of private ownership under Socialism, according to Kautsky, as he considers it impossible to socialize those industries which social production has not yet entered. He concludes with an extremely interesting analysis of the "psychological conditions essential to the domination of the proletariat," where he points out the necessity of transforming the capitalist mind into what might be called the Socialist mind.

The book as a whole is bound to have a profound influence on Socialist thought at this time, and it has already been translated into French and is announced for appearance in "Justice," of London. An English translation is also being prepared for publication in this country, and we have no hesitation in predicting for it an extremely wide

circulation, as it will be absolutely indispensable to any one who wishes to be able to grasp the latest developments in Socialist theory as well as to gain a thorough understanding of the basic principles of Socialism.

The Collapse of Plutocracy. Henry Boothman. For sale by the author at Libby, Mont. Cloth, 271 pp., \$1.

To some extent this work is a reconciliation of the administrative side of Socialism with a modified Single Tax. But it is at once more and less than this. It is more in that it presents one of the most thorough and logical analyses of the processes of capitalist concentration ever published, and it is less in that it misses the fundamental fact that Socialism is not an administrative scheme at all, but is rather a philosophy of social evolution. The author holds that since there are certain industries which have not reached the monopoly point, therefore public ownership is not applicable to the whole productive field. But where competition still exists, the principle of the Single Tax may be applied to tax out all the element of exploitation pending the time (if such time ever arrives) when the monopoly point shall have been reached, when it will be necessary to resort to public ownership. He seems to be blind to the philosophy of the class struggle, although he admits (p. 147) that the interests of the proletarians are in accord with the Socialist position. But he considers this a narrow point of view, not seeming to realize that this class contains all that is essential in our present society and all that is hopeful for the future. Aside from this defect, the book is one of the most stimulating and suggestive that has appeared for some time. There is tendency to consider social evolution as more symmetrical and uniform than it really is, and hence to disregard some very important social factors, which somewhat impairs the accuracy of the conclusions, but adds to the interest of the book.

La Cité Future. E. Tarbouriech. Stock, Paris, publisher. Paper, 484 pp., 3 fr., 50.

In our last issue, attention was called to the fact of the appearance of a new type of utopias. The above work is another example of this, as is also, to some extent at least, the latter portion of Kautsky's "Social Revolution." These new utopias are elaborate studies of a possibly immediate future, rather than dreams of impossibly perfect societies. *La Cité Future* is by far the most elaborate and most valuable of the works of this sort yet published. As working rules for the new society, he adds to the well-known saying: "From each according to his strength; to each according to his needs," the following as essential maxims for the founding of a future society: "To each group of producers an interest in production; to each member of a group an interest in the prosperity of the group; men and women to share equally and without distinction of sex in domestic labor and social production, and finally the commonwealth to become identical with the political nation." An extremely centralized government is presupposed and an elaborate system of bookkeeping is suggested for keeping the accounts

of each producer. An elaborate bureaucracy is described, with departments having charge of almost every function of human life.

As a general thing he endeavors to confine himself to the scientific method and studies what will happen rather than what should. He sees that future evolution will demand a more near approximation of country and city, and will cause something of a breaking up of the great centers of population and a transference of many forms of industry to the country. In the question of the housing of the populace, for example, it seems evident that a great diversity will prevail. Many great industries will have their local villages for the housing of social employes, as is now the instance with many of the great capitalists, save that housing as well as industry will be controlled by the workers. A portion of the population will desire to be relieved of all responsibility of housekeeping, and for these great communal boarding houses can be erected. Others occupied with hand work will want their shop and house together and to some degree isolated.

Production will be carried on by various bodies, such as co-operatives and individual associations, in addition to the great fundamental state shops. Just as many survivals of earlier systems still exist under capitalism, so we may expect that these will not wholly disappear under Socialism. The smaller industries will be largely carried on by private co-operative associations, who will obtain their material from the collectivity and in general be under social control. Artistic production will be largely confined to individual shops, who will, however, be so completely dependent upon the general socialized industry that exploitation will be impossible and control easy, while individual initiative will still have full play.

In the discussion of the training of children he seems to forget what he has said before—that there will be nothing of military discipline in the future society, and lets his imagination run riot in a most pernicious manner, evolving a most fantastic and tyrannical interference with individual liberty, which it is probable will soon be seized upon by some antagonist of "State Socialism" and used as if it were an authoritative pronouncement. This same defect of making the child practically an automaton in the hands of officials runs all through his discussion of education, which is otherwise most valuable and suggestive.

The one great service which the author has performed is the working out of a multitude of details which have been overlooked by the previous and more imaginative writers of utopias. That he has probably come nearer to telling what will be done under Socialism than any previous writer is certain. That he has also made many guesses which will prove to be far from the mark is also probable, but in any case he has made an extremely valuable contribution to Socialist literature.

There was a time not so very long ago when the appearance of a new Socialist pamphlet was an event to be heralded with long reviews by every Socialist publication in the country. To-day it is physically impossible for us to even mention all the excellent pamphlets that come to us for review. One, however, that deserves a little more than a pass-

ing notice is "Good Times," by Comrade George T. Millar, of Chicago. This little book of fifty-one pages, selling at 10 cents, is filled full of good arguments telling why laborers should be Socialists, and will prove a valuable weapon for any Socialist armory.

The Craftsman comes out enlarged to nearly twice its former size and improved and bettered in every way. It has also issued a bound volume of the first numbers, which is a masterpiece of good workmanship, and should be seen by those who are interested in the original and genuine of that which Elbert Hubbard is the cheap imitation and fake.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Books for the Holidays.

December is the great book-buying month of the year. It is becoming more and more a regular custom for friends to send each other books at the Christmas season, and Socialists can do some very effective propaganda work by using Socialist books for their presents. Most of the books issued by our co-operative publishing house are printed and bound in as inexpensive a style as possible, to suit the slender purses of the people who do useful work. We are, however, issuing a few books in dainty holiday style to make them acceptable gifts for those who must be pleased with the appearance of a book before they will open and read it.

First. *The Communist Manifesto*. This is the most important political pamphlet ever published, and hundreds of thousands of copies have been circulated in many languages, but to the average American, especially the "well educated" American, it is still an unknown book. One reason may be that it has invariably been published in a most unattractive form. We are now trying the experiment of issuing it in two really beautiful editions, from new plates. One is a dainty pocket edition with embossed scarlet cover stamped in gold, and the price is 10 cents—just what the inferior editions are selling for. The other is a library edition printed on antique laid paper of extra quality, with wide margins and exquisitely bound in cloth. This will make a beautiful gift well worth preserving in any library. Price 50 cents.

Second. *Walt Whitman, the Poet of the Wider Selfhood*. By Mila Tupper Maynard. Mrs. Maynard is more than ordinarily qualified to interpret Whitman. She was educated for the Unitarian ministry and unites the liberal culture of that church with the wider outlook of the Socialist fellowship, since she is now an active worker in our movement in Denver. The thoughtful essays which make up this book will bring lovers of Whitman into Socialism, and will bring a needed uplift of poetry to the Socialists. Mechanically, the book is more artistic than anything we have yet attempted. Cloth, 145 pages, \$1.

Third. *Gracia, a Social Tragedy*. By Frank Everett Plummer. A story in blank verse, varied with lyrical passages. It is rarely that poems sell outside the circle of the author's acquaintance, but this poem has already gone through two editions, and the third is now ready. It is beautifully illustrated with twelve half-tone engravings, most of them photographs from life of a model who entered into the spirit of the story. The plot is full of the lesson that capitalism degrades and bru-

talizes the lives and loves of its victims. The moral is pointed out in a 10-cent booklet entitled "Was it Gracia's Fault," of which 75,000 have been sold. The price of the holiday volume is \$1.25.

Fourth. *Resist Not Evil*, by Clarence S. Darrow, is an original monograph on the relation of organized society to those whom we call criminals. He shows the fatal defects of present methods of dealing with crime, and gives the reader the clue to the real remedy. Printed in large, clear type that will rest tired eyes, and daintily bound in silk cloth with white stamping. Price, 75 cents.

Fifth. *Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. By Professor Werner Sombart, University of Breslau, Germany. Translated by Anson P. Atterbury. With introduction by John B. Clark, Professor of Political Economy in Columbia University. This work, by a famous scholar, who is not actively identified with the Socialist movement, is accepted by both the friends and opponents of Socialism as a fair statement of actual facts. It is a book that no Socialist speaker or writer can afford to overlook, and its dignified and dispassionate treatment of the subject fits it especially for reaching professional people and others who might not be attracted by our ordinary propaganda literature. The book is printed in large, open type, on the best of paper and bound in silk cloth, with gold lettering. We have reduced the retail price from \$1.25 to \$1.

Sixth. *The Social Revolution*, by Karl Kautsky, an extended review of which appears on another page, is one of the most important Socialist works that has appeared for many years. A translation of this book by A. M. and May Wood Simons will appear in the Standard Socialist Series the first of December. It will be uniform in outward appearance, with "The Origin of the Family," but will be printed in larger type and will be an attractive and readable volume, that every Socialist will want. Price 50 cents.

Seventh. *Oratory, Its Requirements and Its Rewards*. By John P. Altgeld. Few men have had a clearer understanding of the art of oratory than the late Governor Altgeld. This book, published a few months before his death, gives in condensed form a great number of really practical suggestions to the public speaker. It ran rapidly through two editions, and the demand for it has been so great that a third edition is now published. The book is handsomely printed and daintily bound in cloth. Price 50 cents.

For other gift books see our alphabetical list on another page. Remember that any of these books will be mailed to any address on receipt of the advertised price, but that if you are a stockholder they will be mailed for three-fifths of the retail price or sent by express at purchaser's expense for half price. Any one can become a stockholder by sending \$10 or by sending \$1 and promising to pay \$1 a month for nine months.

Why We Need Your Stock Subscription.

The business on its present basis is paying expenses. But more Socialist literature is needed than the capital at our disposal will supply. Socialist sentiment is spreading in this country at a rate that is simply

startling, and if serious errors are to be avoided, education in the principles of Socialism must keep pace with the growth of sentiment. The most important text-book on Socialism is Marx's "Capital." Only one of its three volumes has yet been translated into English. We have imported and sold several hundred copies of this since June. The other two volumes contain about 1,500 pages, and to translate and publish them will involve an outlay of over \$2,000. To raise this will require 200 stock subscriptions at \$10 each. The money can be paid at the rate of \$1 a month. As soon as the 200 subscriptions are pledged, the work will begin.

Socialist Literature for Striking Miners.

Although the coal strike is settled, its lesson has not been lost among the coal miners of Pennsylvania, and it is far easier for them than before the strike to grasp the idea that they should vote to put their own class in control of the government. The result of the November election will be known by the time this number of the Review reaches our readers, and the election returns will undoubtedly show that something has been accomplished by the Socialist literature circulated in the coal region. The contributions made by the readers of the International Socialist Review toward the circulation of literature among the strikers have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$55.15
Mrs. S. D. Whitney, Petaluma, Cal.50
A friend, Chicago	1.25
T. J. Maxwell, Topeka, Kan.	2.00
C. C. Reynolds, Los Angeles, Cal.	5.00
Total	\$63.90

Just Published—Capital and Labor.

Few books have an origin and history like this one. It is nothing more nor less than the combined note-book and scrap-book of a Socialist workingman.

Blacklisted and searching with bitter experiences for a market in which to dispose of his labor-power, then toiling long hours at the most exhausting labor when that market was found, he learned the philosophy of Socialism at a school whose lessons make lasting and vivid impressions. Co-operating with events in the work of teaching these lessons there were certain things that he read or heard spoken.

When he came to see the truth of the Socialist position, he saw that the only way to escape from the life in which capitalism doomed him to live was by helping other working men to see the same truths. Hence this book.

It is a record of the things which made him a Socialist, and of the things which he found most effective in teaching his fellow-workers to become Socialists. Along with these things he has put the arguments


and thoughts which arose from his experience as laborer and Socialist agitator.

Such a book, gathered, published and sent forth in this manner, should certainly not be without effect upon the class for whom it was written. It should challenge the attention of every producer of wealth, and we believe its reading will compel him to see that his place is beside the author and the millions of other workingmen who are seeking to hasten the progress of social evolution toward the time when the conditions portrayed in this book and endured by the writer and his class shall have forever passed away. Paper, 204 pages, 25 cents; to stockholders, 13 cents by mail, or 10 cents by express.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.

The

11



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

DECEMBER, 1902.

NO. 6.

Property Rights and the Coal Miners' Strike.

IF, as has been claimed, it is by the will of God that the anthracite coal mines have become the private property of Mr. Baer and his associates, it would seem that Socialists least of all have cause to quarrel with the decrees of providence or question their wisdom. Whether the course of these men was dictated by greed, or stubbornness, or ignorance of the social forces which they defied and thereby so greatly accelerated, all has been grist for the Socialist mill. Assuredly no fitter instruments could have been chosen to render ridiculous by their extravagance the pretensions of capitalist absolutism. In the storm which they provoked the very pillars of the temple rocked, the veil was rent asunder and the divinity of inalienable and irresponsible property rights shattered beyond repair.

It is, to-day, a new people with which we as Socialists have to deal—a people that has been brought within measurable distance of conditions fraught with incalculable misery. They were forced on us simply by the assertion of the owners' rights to administer their property without reference to the claims of the producers, or to the necessities of the public. In the light of this exhibition of selfish and unbridled power, the assumptions on which capitalism rests are being questioned as never before.

Even before the strike of the coal miners the attention of the public had been challenged by the new conditions resulting from the rapid industrial development. The vast combinations of capital which were taking place all over the world, the concentration of wealth at an ever-increasing pace, the control of the prime factors of production and distribution by small groups of financiers, the rapid growth and aggressiveness of organized labor—these were facts of such a disquieting nature that they could not be ignored. The minds of the people were aroused and apprehen-

sive. Great forces were seen to be at work, which not being understood were feared.

Through all this turmoil of thought there has been a growing consciousness that property rights which had arisen under primitive conditions of production were incongruous with the new order, and that a readjustment was becoming inevitable. It was all very well to grant that a man might do as he would with his own when his possessions were perhaps little more than a patch of arable land, a few primitive tools and a beast of burden. His use of them was of little concern to anyone but himself. Production was mainly directed to supplying his personal needs. But it is a very different matter when a small group of men monopolizes the nation's supply of some prime necessity of life or controls the vast machinery of modern industrial activity. What they may do with their own ceases to be a personal affair. Production is no longer on the scale of individual use. It has become a complex social process involving the co-operation of thousands. It is virtually a public service of vital concern to the welfare of the entire community. Through this development there has been an absolute reversal of the primitive conditions under which the interest of the individual owner was supreme. With socialized production as it exists to-day the interests of the great body of laborers engaged in any industry, as well as those of society at large, vastly outweigh any consideration to which the actual possessors may feel entitled through the traditions of ownership.

It is, indeed, through this survival of primitive property rights, long after they have been outgrown by the processes of production, that society is divided into classes with economic functions and interests diametrically opposed. Through this the dominant class is established in possession of the sources of wealth, with the right to do with them according to its will. It is compacted by the common interest to maintain this antiquated right, instinctively realizing that it is the source of its supremacy and wealth. For by its absolute control of the avenues of production it dictates wage terms to the opposing class of the propertyless, and grants a beggarly subsistence in exchange for the vast product of modern industry.

With such a fundamental antagonism of interests class conflict is inevitable. The vision of industrial peace is a delusion while capitalism survives. The truce which may be patched up by arbitration or forced by exhaustion is but a breathing spell. All the time the forces are gathering for a more powerful or intelligent attack. There can be no real peace between exploiters and exploited. The struggle must go on until the producing class,

educated to a knowledge of the rights which arise from the social function which it performs and grown conscious of its overwhelming power when united, shall grasp the seats of judgment and proclaim the common heritage in the sources of existence and well-being.

Until recently, however, these facts had gained but little recognition in this country outside of the small circle of earnest and indefatigable Socialists. The divine rights of property were fervently maintained by pulpit, press and politicians, the servants of power. The changed conditions under which they are now exercised were ignored. We were told that these rights were the basis of freedom and civilization; that their denial meant a reversion to barbarism. Wealth was a God-given trust, its possession the manifestation of a divine providence to which we should humbly bow. (It is not to be wondered that such convenient and flattering doctrines are gratefully contemplated by the capitalist class, and their promulgation fostered with all its power.) What signify then the squirmings and recantations of these our erstwhile teachers which we have just witnessed? What mean the ravings and denunciations with which they have so recently turned on those whom they were wont to uphold? The cause of their wrath is ludicrous to contemplate. Picture their disconcertment when they discovered that the doctrines which they had spread abroad for the stupefaction and beguilement of the workers had been swallowed by the capitalists instead! For it would appear that Mr. Baer and his associates were actually persuaded of their divine mission, and with blind faith determined to defend to the uttermost civilization and freedom—as the capitalist conceives them. Their hearts were hardened as was Pharaoh's of old. But alas for the reputation of their teachers! What these capitalists sought to establish they have only made ridiculous. The very assertion of these rights reduced them to an absurdity, just as surely as a false principle in mathematics is exposed by applying it. Instead of preserving civilization they almost precipitated chaos. Individual ownership of that which is essential to the welfare of the community was never so glaringly exposed in all its naked brutality and madness as by the obstinacy of these men. Perhaps, after all, their mission was a divine one. "Quos Deus vult perdere, prius dementat." (Whom God would destroy, he first makes mad.)

We have reason, then, to be thankful for the storm that has so cleared the atmosphere. It would seem that just such an object lesson has been needed to demonstrate the fact that individual ownership of the sources of wealth and of the instruments of production and distribution involves subjection to the possess-

ing class of the interests of the mass of the people, and the enslavement to it of the wage-working class. Heretofore the idea that such conditions could exist in this "land of the free" was scouted and resented. The industrial processes were so complex it seemed impossible to make clear the principles underlying them. The concentration of wealth was not yet sufficient, the ownership of it too fluctuating, for the fact of class rule and our subjection to it to be clearly apprehended. Its oppressions were not felt to be inherent; they appeared sporadic, rather, and were accounted the outcome of local conditions, or of the greed and stubbornness of individuals.

In despair of being understood Socialists have often resorted to metaphor, endeavoring to illustrate the industrial situation in its simplest outlines by stripping off all that was incidental and confusing. They pointed out that the unrestricted principle of private property logically involved the right of one man to the earth and all there is in it; pictured him in absolute possession, dictating to its inhabitants the terms of a servile and miserable existence. In this striking manner it was sought to make clear the actual power which the comparatively small possessing class really does exercise over the mass of the people. Doubtless the presentation was sound enough, but somehow it failed to convince. It was like an X-ray photograph. Few could identify the skeleton outlines with the living body before their eyes. But what the Socialist attempted in vain the forces of economic evolution have accomplished. The fancy has become the fact. In the light of recent events it requires little imagination to see one man with a nation by the throat, the representative of the people at his feet, begging for mercy. "I DISCLAIM ANY RIGHT," said our President, "I APPEAL." As a puppet might its makers, so did he entreat the representatives of the class that rules and possesses this country by the divinity of property rights.

The effectiveness of the miners' strike in making plain the fact that the old property relations had been outgrown was shown when the Democratic party of New York adopted a demand that the government seize the mines. Mr. Hill, who was responsible for that plank, is above all things a practical politician. The presence of it in the Democratic platform is good evidence that there was a widespread demand for it, for Mr. Hill is not the man to burden himself with an unpopular cause. It was a shrewdly calculated move that would doubtless have been of great service to the Democratic party had the strike continued until the election; and, in any event, it was probably counted on to check for a time the oncoming of Socialism, much as back firing is resorted to when prairie fires threaten.

Such sops to Socialistic sentiment may be expected from now on with increasing frequency, but happily their power to confuse is becoming a thing of the past with the growing class consciousness of the labor movement. Public ownership under either a Democratic or a Republican administration is seen to be merely a transfer of management from the individual owner to his political servants and the transformation of his bonds and stocks into government securities. To the wage-worker it brings no escape from exploitation and industrial slavery. Witness the effectual manner in which the lash was cracked over the heads of the postal clerks by the Republican administration, when they presumed to agitate for better conditions. Witness also the similar treatment of the Chicago police by a Democratic administration when they endeavored to organize. Labor has nothing to expect from the party which has disfranchised the working class of the South, or from the party whose boast has been that it freed the slaves, yet failed to protect them in their political rights, and now consents to their new enslavement without a move to enforce the penalty which the constitution provides. (How they revere the constitution!)

In making a political issue of the miners' strike the Democrats forced the hands of the administration. The party in power was compelled to bestir itself to end the strike, so as to remove it from the field of political discussion. Agitation of public ownership might be far-reaching and the administration sought an escape from the issue. Its real attitude, however, was exposed by the protest of Mr. Moody, Secretary of the Navy, against the idea of governmental operation of the mines—on the ground that it would cost more than if done by a private concern. In other words, he was no more willing than the mine owners that better conditions should be granted to the miners.

That it was not solicitude for the welfare of the miners, but a frantic desire to end the strike on any terms that moved President Roosevelt is quite evident from his course. What other interpretation can be placed on his action when rebuffed by the operators? Instead of bringing these lawbreakers to terms with the legal power at his command, he turned to the impoverished miners with a flim-flam proposition. No honest man with any regard for their interests could have done it. He asked them to forego the vantage gained by months of privation, resume work on the old terms, and look for redress to an investigating committee of a capitalist Congress.

What relief might be expected from such a source can be estimated from the results of the investigation which had already been made by Carroll D. Wright, of the Labor Bureau, under di-

rection of the President. The main recommendation of his report was a division of the miners' union, the very thing most ardently desired by the operators. No wonder they consented to his being added to the board of arbitration. By such traitors was Samson shorn.

There is other evidence of the President's attitude. The government had been blind to the lawlessness of the operators, but when lawless operators charged the miners with lawlessness the pretext for interference was gratefully seized. The operators claimed that the presence of troops would result in the collapse of the strike and resumption of work on the old terms against which the miners were struggling. With this assurance of breaking the strike the troops were supplied, Secretary of War Root furnishing the equipment to put them in the field at once. But the firmness of the miners defeated this scheme also for ending the strike.

Again did the President show his hand when the operators finally weakened. Their proposition for arbitration was so manifestly unfair to the miners that it met with universal condemnation. Did our strenuous President have the manliness to refuse to become a party to such a piece of trickery, or the dignity to resent the insult to himself in the terms imposed? Not a bit of it. He did his best to secure acceptance of the crafty proposition, finally succeeding after the operators had made some insignificant concessions to the miners' demands. As a finishing touch to this record he secured the addition of that juggling statistician, Carroll D. Wright, to the board of arbitrators. The strike was over and thankfully dropped as a political issue. The arbitrators met, junketed through the coal regions—and *adjourned till after the election.*

The Democratic plank was not the only manifestation of the fact that through this strike property rights were fast losing their sacredness in the eyes of the people. When the Detroit conference formulated its demand for the seizure of the mines and coal carrying railways, it spoke with the authority of a body sufficiently representative to challenge attention. The publicity given to its proceedings and the discussion it evoked, made it plain that not only the coal barons but capitalism itself was being brought to judgment. Conservative capitalists saw the danger and called a halt. As Postmaster General Payne expressed it, "Mr. Morgan and his associates were wise enough to see that the settlement of the coal strike must come or in its place there would be a public agitation, the result of which no man could estimate except that it would be disastrous to the values of great properties. This idea was urged by the President and by others until it had its effect."

Mark the solicitude of the President for the conservation of great properties, if further proof is needed that it was not in the interests of the miners that he labored to end the strike.

One cannot refrain, at this point, from commenting on the character of the Detroit conference in the light of what followed. For no sooner did the operators make their one-sided proposal for arbitration than Mayor Maybury nullified the action of the conference by disbanding the committee which was to present its demands to the President. The miners were left in the lurch even before they had consented to the proposal, probably as the surest way of compelling them to do so. Remember these demands included the prosecution of the operators for their habitual violation of the laws. It was also provided that the mayors represented should collect funds for the support of the miners and their families. Evidently these proposals were to be taken "cum grano salis," for they have not been heard from since. It was, indeed, a "get coal" conference and nothing more. Enforcement of the laws or justice for the miners had no more consideration from this middle class assemblage than at the hands of the President.

Up to this point it is but the surface indications of the breaking away from the old conceptions of property rights that have been considered. The real measure of progress is the phenomenal growth of the Socialist vote in the recent election. It is this that foretells the coming of a new industrial order. Capitalism cannot withstand many shocks such as the miners' strike has given it.

W. S. McC.

Suggested Lines of Socialist Municipal Activity.



At the Indianapolis Convention it was decided that the National Executive Committee be authorized to appoint a sub-committee on municipal activity, this committee to have only advisory powers and to have as one of its functions the formulation of a municipal program for Socialist bodies. Almost exactly a year ago the National Committee elected the following comrades to serve upon this committee: Victor L. Berger, Job Harriman, Emil Lies, and John C. Chase, with the undersigned as Temporary Secretary. Communication was at once opened between these various comrades and steps taken to carry out the will of the convention. As all the members of the committee were actively engaged in other work in connection with the Socialist movement progress has been rather slow.

From time to time the assistance of outside comrades was requested and among those who have co-operated in the preparation of the program up to the present time, and who are now acting as members of the committee, are Comrades Corinne Brown, Seymour Steadman and Philip S. Brown. Effort has been made to keep in communication with the people who have been elected to municipal offices by the Socialists in different parts of the country, and it is hoped that if any such who have not been written, see this that they will address the Secretary at once, as their co-operation is much desired.

The "Suggested Lines of Socialist Municipal Activity" which are given at the close of this article are to be considered simply as a sum total of the various suggestions that have been thought worthy of consideration by one or more members of the committee. They were compiled after careful comparison with a large number of municipal programs in this country as well as those of the European Socialist parties. Whatever may be said of its defects or merits, it is probably the most complete outline of municipal activity yet gathered together and should furnish material for intelligent discussion. It is probably not approved of as a whole, by any single member of the committee, and still less is it to be considered a special recommendation of the committee, and, least of all, does it partake of the character of a proposed platform for Socialist municipal bodies. Such platforms may evolve from it in the future, and it is hoped that it will be of assistance in the formation of such platforms in various cities.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am of the opinion that

a municipal platform could be best made up of a plain revolutionary demand for the overthrow of class rule and a statement of the need of the application of collectivist principles in municipal activity. This would constitute the platform proper and would be about the length of those now ordinarily adopted. In addition to this an elaborate program of probable action could be prepared based upon the suggestions given herewith. This should be accompanied by an explanation that would need to be a rather extensive document, discussing and explaining the various provisions adapted to local needs and show how these form a part of a complete revolutionary program. This was the position which I took at the Indianapolis convention with regard to our National platform, and I have, as yet, seen no reason to change my mind. I say this, because there is persistent misrepresentation of the attitude taken by those who oppose "immediate demands" in the form in which they now appear in the majority of our platforms.

But whatever else may be said there is urgent need of further intelligent discussion of Socialist municipal affairs in this country. It is certain that a large number of Socialists will be elected to municipal positions within the next few months. At the present time there is no general idea of what the Socialist position is on municipal affairs. There is great diversity of attitude on what are really fundamental principles. I am not one of those who believe that municipal action can be reduced to anything like complete uniformity throughout a country presenting as diverse characteristics as does the United States. But there are certain principles and lines of action which apply everywhere, and these should be worked out. It seems to me that in this connection the Belgians offer us the most valuable example. The Belgian Socialists have organized a League of Municipal Councilors with Comrade Emil Vinck, the well-known contributor to the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, as its secretary. They hold regular conventions and have evolved considerable literature on the various questions arising. It would seem possible that something of this character might grow out of our present committee. Such a body has absolutely no authority to enforce its decisions save what comes from the better knowledge which it is able to bring to bear on the questions. It affords an opportunity for the exchange of ideas and the accumulation of information on subjects which are of the greatest importance.

Perhaps these suggestions may be taken in connection with those which follow as the basis of a discussion in the Socialist press. The columns of this publication, as far as space permits, will be gladly opened to any one having any contribution to bring

on this subject. Without further discussion the matter which has been evolved by the committee is given herewith.

A. M. Simons, Sec.

Suggested Lines of Socialist Municipal Activity.

PUBLIC EDUCATION.

I.—Changes in Instruction.

1. Sufficient kindergartens for all children of proper age.
2. Manual training in all grades (not trade schools).
3. General introduction of idea of development and freedom in education with close connection with things, according to principles of modern pedagogy.
4. Teaching of economics and history with evolution of industry as base.
5. Establishment of vacation schools.
6. Adequate night schools for adults.
7. Instruction of children as to child labor legislation and rights of children before the law.

II.—Changes Affecting Teaching Force.

1. Adequate teachers (small classes).
2. Pedagogical training required as a qualification for teaching.
3. Right of trial for teachers when dismissed.
4. Pensions for teachers when superannuated or disabled.

III.—Care of Children.

1. Free text books.
2. Free meals and clothing.
3. Free medical service, inspection for eyes, ears, mental faculties (for educational purposes), and contagion.

IV.—Equipment.

1. Adequate buildings, numerous, not too large.
2. Ample play-grounds with physical instructor in charge.
3. Museums, art galleries, libraries, etc., enlarged and accessible to all children through frequent visits accompanied by teachers.
4. Baths and gymnasiums in each school.
5. All school buildings open evenings, Sundays and holidays for public assemblages.

V.—Miscellaneous Provisions.

1. Inmates of orphan asylums and other public institutions for children required to attend public school.

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP.

I.—Principles of Management.

1. Reduction of hours and increase of wages to correspond with improvements in production.
2. No profits to be used for reduction of taxation.
3. Pensions for all city employes when sick and disabled.
4. Election of supervising officers by employes subject to control of municipality.

II.—Industries Suggested for Ownership.

1. All industries dependent on franchises, street cars, electric and gas lighting, telephones, etc.
2. Public parks, slaughter houses where they are needed.
3. Bakeries, ice-houses, coal and wood yards.

WORKING CLASS GOVERNMENT.

1. Police not to be used in interest of employer against strikers.
2. Free legal advice.
3. Abolition of justice courts (trial by jury without extra expense).
4. Abolition of fines as alternative to imprisonment.
5. Establishment of Municipal Labor Bureau.

GENERAL MEASURES FOR PUBLIC RELIEF.

1. Establishment of works to give employment to unemployed.
2. Free medical service.
3. Adequate hospital service with no taint of charity.
4. Homes for aged and invalid.
5. Night lodgings for men out of employment and without homes.
6. Adequate regular aid to widows with no implication of charity.
7. Pensions for all public employes.
8. Free public crematory.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

1. Inspection of food, punishment of all harmful adulteration.
2. Public disinfection after contagious diseases.
3. Publicly owned and administered baths; wash-houses, closets, laboratories, drug stores and such other things as care of public health demands.

FACTORY LEGISLATION.

1. Special laws for protection of women and children in both mercantile and industrial pursuits.
2. No child under eighteen to be permitted to work at any gainful occupation, including selling papers, blacking shoes, etc.

HOUSING QUESTION.

1. Strict legislation against over-crowding, provision for light and ventilation in all rooms.
2. Building of municipal apartments to rent at cost of care of buildings and depreciation—no return for ground rent to be demanded.
3. Condemnation and destruction by the city of all tenements not conforming to proper standards of light, ventilation and over-crowding.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT.

1. Direct employment by the city—abolition of contract system.
2. Fixing of minimum wage not lower than standard trade union rate.
3. Only union labor to be employed where unions exist.

TAXATION.

1. Progressive income tax where possible.
2. Taxation of ground rents.
3. Exemption of household furniture and laborers' homes.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Erection of "Labor Temple" by municipality as headquarters, meeting place and educational center for laborers of the city.
2. Publication of a municipal bulletin, containing complete news of all municipal activity.

Forms and Weapons of Social Revolution*

What will be the precise form under which the decisive battles between the ruling class and the proletariat will be fought out? When may we expect them to occur? What weapons will be at the service of the proletariat?

To these questions it is hard to give definite answers. We can to a certain degree suggest the *direction* of the development but not its *form* nor its *velocity*. The investigation of the direction of evolution concerns itself only with relatively simple laws. Here one can only isolate from the whole confused manifold, the phenomena which we recognize as not regular or necessary, or which appear to us as accidental. These latter on the contrary play an important part in the determination of the form and the velocity of the movement. For example, in all modern civilization the direction of capitalist development during the last century has been the same, but in every one of them the form and the velocity was very different. Geographical peculiarities, racial individualities, favor and disfavor of the neighbor, the restraint or assistance of great individualities, all these and many other things have had their influence. Many of these could not be foreseen, but even the most easily recognizable of these factors operate upon each other in such diverse ways that the result is so extremely complicated as to be impossible of determination from a previous stage. So it came about that even the people who through fundamental and comprehensive knowledge of the social relations of other civilized countries and by methodical and fruitful methods of research far exceeded all their contemporaries, as for example, Marx and Engels, were able to determine the direction of economic development for many decades in a degree that the course of events has magnificently justified. But even these investigators could strikingly err when it came to the question of predicting the velocity and form of the development of the next month.

There is only one thing I think that can be said with certainty to-day about the approaching revolution. It will be wholly different from any of its predecessors. It is one of the greatest mistakes that revolutionists as well as their opponents frequently commit to present the coming revolution according to the model of past ones for there is nothing easier than to prove that such revolutions are no longer possible. The conclusion is then at hand that

* This extract is taken from the advance proofs of Karl Kautsky's "The Social Revolution," translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons. This work is now in press and will be issued by Charles H. Kerr and Company in their Standard Socialist Series. Translation authorized by K. Kautsky.

the idea of a social revolution is an entirely outgrown one. It is the first time in the history of the world that we are confronted with a revolutionary struggle to be fought out under the application of democratic forms by organizations created upon the foundation of democratic freedom against resources such as the world has not yet seen, prominent among which are organizations of employers before which even monarchs bow, and whose power will be strengthened by the governmental powers of bureaucracy and militarism, which the modern great nations have inherited from absolutism.

One of the peculiarities of the present situation consists in the fact that, as we have already pointed out, it is no longer the governments which offer us the harshest resistance. Under absolutism, against which former revolutions were turned, the government was supreme and class antagonisms could not clearly develop. The government hindered not alone the exploited but also the exploiting classes from freely defending their interests. On the side of government there stood only a portion of the exploiting class; another and a very considerable part of the exploiters, namely, the industrial capitalists, were in the camp of the opposition, together with the whole mass of the laboring class—not simply proletarians, but also the small bourgeois and the peasants—except in some backward localities. Government was also isolated from the people. It had no hold on the broad masses of the populace; it represented the most highly favored strength of the oppression and the exploitation of the people. A *coup d'état* could under certain circumstances suffice to overthrow it.

In a democracy not alone the exploited but the exploiting class can more freely develop their organization, and it is necessary that they do this if they are to be able to resist their opponents. The strength not only of the former but of the latter as well is greater than under absolutism. They use their forces recklessly and more harshly than the government itself, which no longer stands above them, but rather beneath them.

The revolutionary circles have also to deal not only with the government but also with the powerful organizations of the exploiters. And the revolutionary circles no longer represent as in the early revolutions an overwhelming majority of the people opposed to a handful of exploiters. To-day they represent in reality only one class, the proletariat, to which not only the whole body of the exploiting class, but also the whole body of the farmers, and a great majority of the intellectuals could stand opposed.

Only a fraction of the intellectuals and the very small farmers and the little bourgeois who are actually wage-workers and dependent on their custom unite with the proletariat. But these

are decidedly uncertain allies; they are all greatly lacking in just that weapon from which the proletariat draws all its strength—organization.

While the former revolutions were uprisings of the populace against the government, the coming revolution with the exception perhaps of Russia will have more of the character of the struggle of one portion of the people against another, and therein, and *only* therein resemble more the struggles of the Reformation than the type of the French Revolution. I might almost say that it will be much less of a sudden uprising against the authorities than a long drawn out *civil war*, if one does not necessarily join to these last words the idea of actual slaughter and battles. We have no ground to think that barricade battles and similar warlike accompaniments will play a decisive role to-day. The reasons for this have been given so often that I have no need of dallying longer concerning them. Militarism can only be overthrown by rendering the military itself faithless to the rulers, not through its being conquered by popular uprisings.

We have just as little to expect from a financial crisis as from an armed uprising in producing a collapse of existing conditions. In this respect the situation is also wholly different from that of 1789 and 1848. At that time capitalism was still weak, the accumulation of capital still slight and capital difficult to obtain. In this relation capital was partially hostile to absolutism or at least distrustful of it. The government was dependent upon capital and especially upon industrial capital and its development was impossible without it, or at least against its will. The dying feudalism, however, led to the drying up of all material sources of help so that the government received even less money from its lands and was ever more dependent upon the money lenders. This finally led to financial collapse or to concessions to the struggling class either of which events were able to bring about a political collapse.

It is wholly different to-day. Capitalism does not, like feudalism, lead to under-production, but to over-production, and chokes in its own fat. It is not a lack of capital, but superfluity of capital which to-day demands profitable investment and in pursuit of dividends draws back from no risk. The governments are completely dependent upon the capitalist class and the latter has every reason to protect and support them. The increase of public debts can only become a revolutionary factor in so far as it increases the pressure of taxes and therewith leads to an unrising of the lower classes, but scarcely (Russia perhaps must be excepted) to a direct financial collapse, or even to a serious financial embarrassment of the government. We have just as little cause to expect a revolution from a financial crisis as from an armed insurrection.

One means of battle and the exercise of influence, which is peculiar to the proletariat, is the organized withholding of labor—the *strike*. The more the capitalist manner of production develops and capital concentrates, the more gigantic the dimensions of the strike, and the more the capitalist manner of production presses the small industries, the more will the whole of society become dependent upon the undisturbed continuance of capitalist production and the more will every important disturbance of this latter, as for instance, a strike of great dimensions, bring with it national calamities and political results. At a certain height of economic development the strike will at once suggest itself as a means for political struggle. It has already appeared as such in France and Belgium and has been used with good results. In my opinion it will play a great role in the revolutionary battles of the future.

That has been my view for a long time. In my articles on the new party programme of 1891 (*Neue Zeit*, 1890-1891, No. 50, page 757) I pointed out the possibility that "under certain conditions, when a great decision is to be made, when great events have moved the labor masses to their depths an extensive cessation of labor may easily have great political results."

Naturally, I am not using the idea of a general strike in the sense that the anarchists and the French trade unionists use the word. To these latter the political and especially the Parliamentary activity of the proletariat is to be supplemented by the strike and it is to become a means to throw the social order overboard.

That is foolish. A general strike in the sense that all the laborers of the country at a given sign shall lay down their labor presupposes a unanimity and an organization of the laborers which is scarcely possible in present society, and which if it were once attained would be so irresistible that no general strike would be necessary. Such a strike would, however, at one stroke render impossible the existence not simply of existing society but all existence, and that of the proletarians long before that of the capitalist, and must consequently collapse uselessly at just the moment when its revolutionary virtue began to develop.

The strike as a political weapon will scarcely ever, certainly not in any time now visible, take on the form of a strike of *all* the laborers of a country. It can also not have the purpose of *displacing* the other means of political struggle but only of *supplementing* and *strengthening* them. We are now entering upon a time where opposed to the overwhelming power of organized capital an isolated non-political strike will be just as hopeless as is the isolated parliamentary action of the labor parties opposed to the pressure of capitalistically dominated governmental powers.

It will be ever more necessary that both should grow and draw new strength from co-operation.

As is the case with all new weapons the best manner to use a political strike must first be learned. It is not a cure-all as the anarchists announce it, and it is not an infallible means, under all conditions, as they consider it. It would exceed my purposes to investigate here the conditions under which it is applicable. Considering the latest events in Belgium I might observe that these have shown how very much it demands its own peculiar methods which do not favorably combine with other methods, as for example, with alliances with Liberals. I do not necessarily reject such an alliance under all conditions. It would be foolish for us not to utilize the disagreements and divisions of our opponents. But one should not expect more from the Liberals than they are able to grant. In the field of proletarian activity it may be easily possible under certain conditions that the opposition between them and us in regard to this and that measure may be less than between them and our bourgeois opponents. At such a time an alliance may have a place. But outside of the parliamentary field any effort for a revolutionary demand cannot be fought with Liberal aid. To seek to strengthen proletarian powers in such a struggle by a Liberal alliance is to attempt to use the weapons *for* a purpose that are ordinarily used to *defeat* that purpose. The political strike is a powerful proletarian weapon that is applicable only in a battle which the proletariat fights alone and in which it enters against the total bourgeois society. In this sense it is perhaps the most revolutionary weapon of the proletariat.

Moreover it is probable that still other means and methods of battle will develop of which we do not even dream to-day. There is this difference between the understanding of the *methods* and *organs* and of the *direction* of the social battle that the latter can be theoretically investigated in advance while the former are created in practice and can only be observed by the logicians afterwards, who can then investigate their significance for further evolution. Unions, strikes, corporations, trusts, etc., have sprung from practice and not from theory. In this field many surprises for us may yet appear.

As a means of hastening the political development and of bringing the proletariat into a position of political power war may play a part. War has already often shown itself to be a very revolutionary factor. There are historical situations in which revolution is necessary to the further progress of society but where the revolutionary classes are still too weak to overthrow the ruling powers. The necessity of revolution does not always imply that the aspiring classes should have just the right

strength at just the right moment. Unfortunately the world is not yet so purposefully planned as this. There are situations where revolution is undoubtedly demanded, where one ruling class should be displaced by another, but where the latter is still held in firm subjection by the former. If this situation continues too long the whole society collapses. Very often in such a situation war fulfills the function to which the aspiring class has not yet grown. It fulfills this in two ways. War can be carried on only by the exercise of all the powers of a people. If there is a deep division in the nation war will compel the governing class to grant concessions to the aspiring class which they would not have attained without the war.

If the governing class is not capable of such a sacrifice or yields too late for it to be effective then war can easily lead to defeat from without which carries with it a collapse within. A government resting mainly upon an army is overthrown as soon as the army is defeated.

So it has not unfrequently happened that war has been an extremely efficient means, even if brutal and destructive, to bring about a progress of which other means were incapable.

The German bourgeois, for example, was rendered too weak by the transference of the economic center of Europe to the sea coast of the Atlantic Ocean, and by the thirty years' war and its results to overthrow by its own strength the feudal absolutism. It was freed from this only through the Napoleonic wars and then later through the wars of the Bismarckian era. The legacy of 1848 was realized upon mainly through the wars of the counter-revolutionary forces as these forces had themselves been formerly established.

To-day we are in a period of external and internal political antagonisms analogous to that which existed in the 50's and 60's. Once more a mass of social tinder has accumulated. The problems of external and internal politics demanding solution become ever more tremendous. But none of the ruling classes or parties dare earnestly to attempt their solution because this is not possible without great upheavals and they shrink back from these because they have learned to know the gigantic power of the proletariat which every such great upheaval threatens to set free.

I have referred above to the decay of the internal political life which finds its most striking expression in the increasing decadence of Parliaments. But hand in hand with this is the decay of external politics. Every energetic policy that may lead to an international conflict is shunned, not from an ethical dislike of but for fear of the revolution, whose forerunner it may be. Accordingly the statesmanship of our rulers consists simply, not internally, but also externally, in placing every question

upon the shelf and thereby increasing the number of unsolved problems. Thanks to this policy there now exists a row of shadow States such as Turkey and Austria, which an energetic revolutionary race of a half century ago placed on the list of extinct States. On the other side, and for the same reason, the interest of the bourgeoisie has ceased completely to stand for an independent Polish national state.

But these social craters are not put out, they may burst out again any day in devastating war, like Mt. Pelee at Martinique. Economic evolution itself continually creates new craters, new causes of crises, new points of friction and new occasions for war-like developments, in that it awakens in the ruling classes a greed for the monopolization of the markets and the conquest of foreign colonies and in that it substitutes for the peaceful attitude of the industrial capitalist, the violent one of the financier.

The single security for freedom is found to-day in the fear of the revolutionary proletariat. We have yet to see how long this will restrain the ever increasing causes of conflict. And there are also a number of powers who have no independent revolutionary proletariat to fear and many of these are completely dominated by an unscrupulous, brutal clique of men of the "high finance." These powers, hitherto insignificant or peace-loving in international politics, are continuously becoming more prominent as international disturbers of peace. This is true most of all of the United States, but also of England and Japan. Russia has figured previously in the first place in the list of international disturbers; her heroic proletariat has momentarily restrained her. But just as over-confidence of a government in unrestricted interior power with no revolutionary class at its back, so also can the despair of a tottering government kindle a war. This was the case with Napoleon III. in 1870 and perhaps may yet be the case with Nicholas II. The great danger to the people of the world to-day is from these powers and their antagonisms and not from such as exist between Germany and France, or between Austria and Italy. We must reckon on the possibility of a war within a perceptible time and therewith also the possibility of political convulsions that will end directly in proletarian uprisings or at least in opening the way to them.

Let no one misunderstand me. I am investigating here, not prophesying and still less am I expressing wishes. I investigate what may happen; I do not declare what will happen, least of all do I demand what should happen. When I speak here of war as a means of revolution, that does not say that I desire war. Its horrors are so terrible that to-day it is only military fanatics whose ghastly courage could lead them to demand a war in cold blood. But even when a revolution is not a means to an end

but an end in itself, which even at the most bloody price could not be too dearly purchased, still one cannot desire war as a means to release revolution for it is the most irrational means to this end. It brings such terrible destruction and creates such gigantic demands upon the State that any revolution springing from it is heavily loaded with tasks that are not essential to it but which momentarily absorb all its means and energy. Consequently a revolution which rises from war is a sign of the weakness of the revolutionary class, and often the cause of further weakness, just because of the sacrifice that it brings with it, as well as by the moral and intellectual degradation to which war gives rise. It also increases enormously the tasks of the revolutionary regime and simultaneously weakens its powers. Accordingly a revolution springing from a war is easier wrecked or sooner loses its motive force. How wholly different were the results of the bourgeois revolution in France where it arose from an uprising of the people, from those in Germany, where it was imported through a number of wars. And the proletarian cause would have received much greater justice from the uprising of the Parisian proletariat if it had not been prematurely brought about by the war of '70 and '71, but had waited until a later period in which the Parisians would have had sufficient strength to have driven out Louis Napoleon and his band without a war.

We also have not the slightest ground to wish for an artificial acceleration of our advance by a war.

But things do not move according to our wishes. To be sure men make their own history, but they do not choose according to their desires the problems which they have to solve, nor the conditions under which they live, nor the means through which these problems are to be solved. If it came according to our wishes who of us would not prefer the peaceable to the violent road for which our present strength has perhaps not sufficiently grown and which perhaps would swallow us up. But it is not our task to express pious wishes and to demand of the world that it move in accordance with them, but to recognize the tasks, conditions and means which arise and to use the latter purposefully to a solution of the former.

Investigation of existing facts is the foundation of any rational policy. If I have arrived at the conviction that we are entering upon a revolutionary epoch, concerning whose conclusions everything is not yet clear, I am driven thereto by the investigation of actual conditions and not by my desires. I desire nothing more than that I may be wrong and that those may be right who maintain that the greatest difficulties of the transition period from capitalism to socialism lie behind us, and that we have all the essential foundations for a peaceful advance to socialism.

Unfortunately I see no possibility of accepting this view. The greatest and the most difficult of the battles for political power still lies before us. It will be decided only after a long and hard struggle that will test all our powers to the utmost.

One can do nothing worse to the proletariat than to advise it to rest upon its arms in order to encourage a favorable attitude of the bourgeoisie. Under present conditions this means nothing less than to deliver the proletariat over to the bourgeoisie and bring it into intellectual and political dependence upon the latter, to enervate and degrade it and make it incapable of fulfilling its great historical purposes.

The proof that this is not exaggerated is furnished by the English laborers. Nowhere is the proletariat more numerous, nowhere is its economic organization better developed, nowhere is its political freedom greater than in England, and nowhere is the proletariat politically more helpless. It has not simply lost all independence in the higher politics. It no longer knows how to even preserve its immediate interests.

Here also we may again refer to the previously cited article of Webb, which certainly cannot be suspected of being consciously revolutionary. "During the upward movement of the last ten years," he says, in the previously mentioned article, "the participation of the English laborers in labor politics has gradually decreased. The eight-hour law and the constructive Socialism of the Fabians to which the unions turned so eagerly in the period of '90 and '93 ceases more and more to occupy their thoughts. The number of labor representatives in the Lower House does not increase."

Even the latest scourgings of their opponents have not served to rouse the proletariat of England. They remain dumb, even when their hands are rendered powerless, dumb when their bread is made more costly. The English laborers to-day stand lower as a political factor than the laborers of the most economically backward country in Europe—Russia. It is the real revolutionary consciousness in these latter that gives them their great political power. It is the renunciation of revolution, the narrowing of interest to the interests of the moment, to the so-called practical politics, that have made the latter a cipher in actual politics.

But in this practical politics the loss of political power goes hand in hand with moral and political degradation.

I have referred above to the moral re-birth of the proletariat which has transformed them from the barbarians of modern society into the most significant factor in the maintenance and furtherance of our culture. But they have only so risen when they have remained in sharpest antagonism to the bourgeoisie; where the strife for political power has kept alive in them the conscious-

ness that they are called to raise themselves together with the whole of society. Here, again, England offers us an illustration of a laboring class who renounce revolution and care only for practical politics, laughing scornfully at their ideals hung on a peg at one side and casting from them every goal of battle that they cannot express in pounds and shillings. From the mouths of the bourgeois themselves come complaints of that moral and intellectual decay of the elite of the English laborers which they share with the bourgeoisie itself and to-day indeed they are scarcely more than little bourgeois and are distinguished from them only by a somewhat greater lack of culture. Their highest ideal consists in aping their masters and in maintaining their hypocritical respectability, their admiration for wealth, however it may be obtained, and their spiritless manner of killing their leisure time. The emancipation of their class appears to them as a foolish dream. Consequently, it is foot-ball, boxing, horse racing and opportunities for gambling which move them the deepest and to which their entire leisure time, their individual powers, and their material means are devoted.

One seeks hopelessly to rouse by political preaching the English laborers to a higher way of life, to a mind capable of nobler considerations. The ethic of the proletariat flows from its revolutionary efforts and it is these which have strengthened and ennobled it. It is the idea of the revolution which has brought about that wonderful elevation of the proletariat from its deepest degradation, which elevation stands as the greatest result of the second half of the nineteenth century.

To this revolutionary idealism we must above all cling fast, then come what will, we can bear the heaviest, attain the highest, and remain worthy of the great historical purpose that awaits us.

Capitalism an Ethical Movement.

THERE is a fad called pessimism, a gentleman's fad; which while despairing of the general believes always in the particular man in spite of its cynical contrasts. When I say it is a fad, I do not thereby deny that it is a conviction rightly, that is, necessarily begotten in fairly sincere minds, whose lives have been lived on false premises. The impossibility of decent society by any other means than the conquest and privation of the masses under the immoral fixtures of private property, forces the thinking man either to deny morality to society itself, or to deny it altogether, or to deny it of the individual. That morality is vital logic he does not know; that the mind does no other sort of reasoning but moral reasoning, which for the convenience and safety of high classed sinners, has been turned off into verbal, or literal, or geometrical, or numerical forms, and thus called pure reason; disguises, which it will be a part of the evolution of the intellect under Socialism to take off, and thus restore pure reason to mankind, in its own robes; the robes of morality.

Now the sincere gentleman who has come to the forked roads, just mentioned, being above all things convinced of himself, reduces his three roads to one, that is;—whether there is any morality. If there is none, and everything around tends to convince him of this, he is alone in the world; and that is where suicide comes in, or this tremendous scorn of insane ego—pessimism. The gift of scorn becomes highly developed in the man who loves himself too well, he does not wish to quarrel with himself at home nor to tell that self before others how much he despises him; but he tells himself abroad, he does not spare himself in the other fellow.

"You cannot afford to know any hero upon this earth," he cries, if you want to remain in the enjoyment of your delusion as a hero worshiper "Keep away from the man you admire," and he pauses there. He is a pessimist because he pauses there.

The way to truth is without pauses, it is an unbroken way. He has uttered a part of the great truth of life. He has expressed a section of the endless vital cable of truthing, one section of it only, and then he went asleep.

Herein lies the marrow of evolutionary collective truth, as compared with truth manifested to ego. The first never breaks off; its truth is in its vitality; its vitality is in its power continuously and its omnipresence.

When the collectionist has done his life of truthing he will leave the end of the last nerve, the last vein, the last fibre of truth which he has handled, still quick and quivering, ready to be taken up and attached to, by the next live thinking of any school that follows. Truth is a flowing on life.

Contrary to this, the unevolutional thinker, for no individual thinker whatsoever may be his protests to the contrary, or however he may patronize evolutionary philosophy, can be a thought evolutionist; asserts a truth once, writes it down law and retires from truthing to look after his property, for which in fact, his entire philosophy is but an afterthought or a policeman. This individualist has become tired with thinking, especially with other persons' thinking in which, indeed, he sees the only constant peril in sight for his property. He has become pessimistic concerning other people's right of going on to think, miserable crew that they are, after he has left off; therefore he wants to close up the fountain with the seal of definition and final law.

The individualist though always on the way to pessimism, concerning things outside of himself and his property, is really never consciously pessimistic of himself; and never at all pessimistic as to his ability to wrap up truth in a final statement of his own—a law, which he bequeaths to posterity, or to nature, just telling them how to go for ever after he has ceased to tick. He winds up the world, makes his will and commits suicide. He has lived and died an exhibit of the agonizing impossibility of the private life, as the motor of society. He, like all other merely private thinkers, does his little part of world thought, not in a continuous line, for the limit of one life forbids that, but in a pendulous swing over a small arc of the circle; the perpendicular line of which separates *mine* from *thine*. This is the perpetual agony of indecision which at last the egoist pessimist settles by resting, he is defeated as a thinker; being handicapped by the private consideration which stands like a ghost over all his meditations; and he acknowledges his moral defeat and unfaith by becoming a moral suicide—a pessimist.

He asks if life is worth living and decides that it is not, "but that the things that are in it are worth having." He says life is not worth living because he never lived in the whole life of a man, he never lived outside his own private property relation. He transfers the sanctions of deed and thought from human life to the things produced by it; not to the life produced by it, as the collectivist does, who regards each deed and thought as on the line of a great organic process from the private to the public way. He turns all his interest from men to their property; and proceeds to steal that—to organize a government for the pur-

pose of confiscating by law all the property of labor as it is in process of production. He proceeds ultimately to give moral significance to the quantitative side of his gettings, his new life; he measures manhood by this sort of success and scales up the moral standard of humanity in figures of from one to nine ciphers. He settles here, just as might be expected from a life that is not a mind in evolution, but a mind seeking surcease of thought and the reign of law; law in fixity, the law of "thus far," which he can state and of which he is the interpreter, and not that reign of law which a collectivist will teach; the law which expresses itself evermore in a motion out of itself; not to better things (which are incidents of the progress); but to better law, to the progression onwards of a universal life out of ego.

I am condemning no man for this teaching, nor for any other erroneous believing or thinking. I hold that the wail of the pessimist is one of the wholesomest things we have heard in our century. I know that the private property man only reasons in parts; across that little segment of his estate which time and place have assigned him on the circle of life; and I claim that there is a mind a-coming, which will, like a charge of electricity, break from one system of philosophy to another and reveal to the astonished doctrinaires how sacred all thought has been; and how it is possible when standing on the social mount to find a pattern which includes them all.

When the pessimist told us all to get away far from the men that we would continue to admire, he had reached one side of his own swinging pendulum only, and stopped there. Suppose he had continued, even within his own area, and own possibilities. Suppose he had permitted the pendulum to swing to the other side; he would then have the counterman, "Come near to the man you despise and look at him earnestly, and begin your life's work there with him." Do you despise the workers? Is the class struggle utterly a loathesome thing to you? Come near to it. Your only way to escape moral death is to learn to live and work for that which you love not, that is to work for the life outside of you. Since you love no other life, at present, but your own.

There may come a time, thousands of years hence, when altruism will too much weaken the private and personal stem. When that weakness comes the current of universal life will turn the other way.

Evil and good, which philosophy and religionists have been so long eager to get into parchment, or to print, will not go in; because they are together parts of one process. Evil is the discovering of the superfluous. Good is the putting of it out of the way. The first part of the function is performed by the single

life, the second by the sub-conscious or collective life. In other words, the private life is negative and critical, its whole ethical range is to take things out of the way; while the public life is a construction, an integration of organically elected things, thoughts, institutions, etc., discovered by the private scavenger. The private life is a casting off of old tissue, the public or manhood life is that force which is taking up always new and untried matter in an effort to absorb it, literally particles of matter, out of a yet unreclaimed universe, as well as of the thoughts, with which they have now kindred.

Now nothing in all this universe shall be lost to life ultimately—the whole will yet live. And certainly no human thoughts, or experiences, or philosophies, or religions, shall be long deemed unclean things.

Capitalism is strictly a moral movement. Its master idea of the economic handling of labor is on a clear parallel with the conception of truth above stated, which conception, I believe, can not easily be refuted and may not be opposed by those who believe in a progressive world.

In the pulse of its machinery, in the iron bound hands of the multitude of workers to one purpose, in its gradual disarming of the private man industrially, pointing thereby to the general disarming of the private masterhoods of the race; in its world market vision, soon to be extended to other hopes than that of the profit monger; in its imposed and despotic internationalism of helplessness to the laboring world, soon to burst into the power of international helpfulness; in its steady development of the idea that the unrequired shall be cast off—the spare man, the surplus worker. In this economic tragedy of commerce, it is working out all the great hope of the world and establishing the ethic of the future.

Capitalism needs only one thing left out of it to be Socialism, and that is the private property demand for finality. Take that away and you take away its evil; and lo it moves on, a part of the grand universal march of humanity.

Peter E. Burrowes.

A German Municipal Program.

AT the recent national convention of the German Socialist Party, held in Munich during the latter part of September, Dr. Lindemann introduced the following resolution on municipal politics which was adopted:

1. The municipality serves a two-fold purpose in the modern state. It is a local administration, serving the economic and social interests of a population confined to a certain place, and it is an auxiliary organ of administrative and political control by the state. In either case, the municipality is subject to the tendency, resulting from the class organization of the state and society, of shaping the administrative policy in the interest of the ruling class.

2. True to its fundamental principle that the way for a rational administration in the interest of all members of society can only be cleared by the abolition of class rule, the Socialist Party demands the complete reorganization of the municipal administration on the principle that all local administration is at the same time state administration, subject only to the law and the courts. As means for this purpose are advocated:

a. Election of municipal representatives by universal, equal direct and secret ballot; adherence to the principle of equal rights to all members of the municipality; abolition of all privileges of property.

b. Restriction of the right of supervision by the state to the right of inspecting the activity of the municipality; abolition of the right of the state to control the local administration.

c. Adjustment of municipal taxation in an equitable manner; abolition of all municipal duties on food stuffs; contribution of the state to the funds required by the municipality for sanitation, public schools, assistance to the poor; a progressive tax on incomes, wealth, and legacies; special municipal taxes on land and buildings, according to their value.

3. The municipal activity finds its special expression in the field of public hygiene, supervision of buildings and homes, social economy, care of the destitute, public education and public franchises.

The following principles are the basis of municipal administration:

a. The installation and administration of municipal plants shall take place under the management of the municipality.

b. All public services, if charged for, shall be given at cost.

4. The following detailed demands are made in regard to the different fields of municipal activity.

A.—Public Hygiene.

1. Conservation of public health. Municipal management of drainage, scavenger work, street cleaning, sewage, public closets.

Regulation of the supply of necessities of life by the institution of public market halls, department stores, stock yards and abattoirs, bureaus of examination and testing, by the production and distribution of milk, bread, meat, and the control of the drink traffic.

Physical training by the help of public baths, public gymnasiums, and public play grounds, and parks.

2. Cure and prevention of disease by the erection of public hospitals, homes for consumptives, insane asylums, homes for convalescents, pregnant women and babies, quarantine stations, accident stations, public drug stores, etc.

3. Transfer of the undertaking business to the municipality, obligatory institution and employment of morgues, burial of all members of the municipality without distinction and free of charge.

B.—Supervision of Buildings and Homes.

1. Acquisition of land by the municipality, revision and completion of building plans and building ordinances, abolition of the tenement system, encouragement of small builders, completion and management of the street railway system.

2. Institution of public real estate offices for the purpose of inspecting buildings, gathering statistics, and furnishing information to home seekers.

3. Building of homes and renting of the same at a price that will cover the cost of erection, keeping in repair, and gradually repay the capital.

C.—Public Education.

1. Uniform public schools. Free instruction, text-books and other necessary materials. The principles of school hygiene and pedagogy to be the sole consideration in building, supplying and conserving school houses, in fixing the number of pupils in a class, the school hours of pupils and teachers; institution of auxiliary classes for slow-witted pupils; care of the pupils' health by school physicians; free distribution of food for pupils. Opening of the universities to the talented children of the proletariat.

2. Institution and management of public libraries and reading rooms, and of institutes for public amusement, such as public theaters, public music halls, etc.

D.—Public Franchises.

Municipal administration of water works, lighting plants, power houses, public warming houses, street railways, steamboats, docks, warehouses, etc., and of advertising publications, bill posting, etc.

E.—Political Economy.

1. General Economy.

More effective protection for laborers; institution of labor exchanges with the duties of statistical bureaus, employment agencies, care of the unemployed, information to applicants, and supervision of municipal labor questions; regulation of the contract system in such a manner that union wages are paid in contracts carried out by the municipality, and by private contractors doing work for the municipality; elimination of the strike clause; prohibition of making contracts for municipal work with members of the public service of the municipality.

2. Special Economy.

Institution of labor committees for the purpose of taking care of the interests of the laborers; employed in the municipality; fixing of rules and conditions of work with the assistance of the labor committees and of the trade union committee of the municipal laborers; fixing of the scale of wages on a trade union basis; increase of wages with the number of years of employment; eight hour day; vacation with full pay; foundation of funds for old age pensions, for widows and orphans; extension of insurance against old age, sickness, accidents, and inability to work to all employes of the municipality.

F.—Care of the Destitute.

Secularization of charity; far-reaching employment of honorary members, especially of women; open and sufficient assistance to poor; care of physically suffering poor in special homes; erection of houses of refuge and warming halls without police control; care of orphans and foster children on hygienic and pedagogic principles.

Much of what Dr. Lindermann said in support of his resolution also holds good in the United States. Some of the points of his resolution, however, are of no moment in this country, on account of the vastly different conditions. We are, of course, fully in harmony with his general remarks on the relation of the municipality and the state, which are in substance as follows:

Municipal politics are limited by the fact that the municipality is a comparatively small territory within the frame work of the state. A thousand threads are connecting the municipality with the state and with other municipalities. Every progress of the municipality is thus economically and politically dependent on

the conditions of the state. It is clear that we cannot municipalize such branches of industry as are not yet organized to the point of maturity by the capitalists. Progress is not alone dependent on the distribution of power in the municipality, but also on the relative power of the different classes in the state. We cannot have a communist municipality within the capitalist state any more than we can have a successful communist colony. The capitalist state and law would soon make an end of it. The municipality as well as the state are controlled by the ruling classes. The progress of the municipality cannot, therefore, be any more rapid than that of the state. The administration and organization of the municipality cannot be very much ahead of that of the state.

Still the state cannot escape from the effect of marked desire for progress in the municipality. No decree of any centralized power can make progress possible, until the municipality is ready for it. The unsuccessful laws of the last decade prove that. On the other hand, if the municipality is ready for progress, the state cannot long oppose it.

For these reasons the active participation of the Socialist Party in municipal administration is of the greatest importance. The direct effect of this participation is often more appreciable than our participation in state and national government. The members of the municipality stand nearer to its administration than to that of the state and nation, and the elections to municipal offices are more frequent.

In order to make the direct influence of the voters on the municipal representatives more effective, it is necessary that the municipality should be autonomous, and independent of state control. The right of the state to interfere by its political and judiciary power must be restricted. The relation of the American municipality to the state is different from that in the old countries. For this reason the remarks of Dr. Lindemann on this point are irrelevant to our local problems. The American Socialist Party must define its own position on this question. Under the present circumstances, the national convention cannot lay down any rule that can be followed equally well in all states. For nearly every state has different laws regulating the relation of the municipality to the state, ranging from the Massachusetts town meeting to the "Ripper"-legislation of Pennsylvania. The national convention can, therefore, at best only declare what it would regard as the ideal relation of the municipality to the state, and leave it to the judgment of the different state parties to solve the question as best they may. So much is certain, that in those states, where "Ripper"-legislation places the municipality at the

mercy of the state, the Socialists will do well to concentrate their attack on the state rather than on the municipality in order to strike at the root of the capitalist fort of politics.

In order to make the members of the municipality the arbiters of their own fate, all adult members of both sexes must have the right to vote. And this right must not be curtailed by any poll tax or by any change of residence from one part of the town to another. The only restriction on the franchise should be a certain time of residence in the city previous to the elections. Any attempt to "colonize" voters shortly before election should be prevented.

The question of the regulation of taxation also presents a different aspect in this country than in Germany. While Dr. Lindemann, and with him the national convention of the German Socialists, demand the regulation of taxation by the state, we in the United States cannot indorse this position without at the same time renouncing the principle of local autonomy. Not only is the majority of the American working class exempt from certain taxes which the German workingman is forced to pay to the municipality and the state for various purposes, but there is no conflict between the municipality and the state on the apportionment of taxes, unless political wirepullers use "Ripper"-legislation to exploit the taxpayers for the benefit of their own political party.

Very little good can be accomplished for the American working class by any form of taxation, unless we succeed in establishing a graduated income tax on land, buildings, and capitalist incomes for the purpose of using the funds thus obtained for the benefit of the working class. The great incomes being derived from surplus values wrung from the working class either by direct exploitation in the process of production or by direct and indirect "taxation" in the process of consumption, the restoration of these surplus values to the working class by the graduated income tax is the main concern of the American Socialist Party. But this will hardly be instituted in an American municipality, until the Socialists control the supreme courts of the state and nation.

Dr. Lindemann's remarks on the building and housing question contain much which we can accept without any restriction. We fully agree with him that the purchase of land, buildings, and railways by the municipality is nothing but a palliative and does not change the fact, and very little of the intensity, of exploitation. This whole municipal and Fabian Socialism is only one of the many social illusions with which reformers deflect the attention of the working class from the main trouble, capitalist exploitation

by the help of private ownership of the essential means of production. They help the working class very little. The great means of emancipation, the expropriation of the capitalists from the land and means of production and distribution, can only be the work of a majority of class conscious workers. All these measures belong much more to the domain of the crushed middle class, which, though proletarian in fact, still is bourgeois in mind, than to the work of the Socialist party, especially under the present advanced economic conditions in the United States. Still the Socialist representatives in the municipalities will use their best efforts to have suitable legislation of this kind enacted, which would certainly bring some relief to the working class.

There is nothing in the other demands of Dr. Lindemann's resolution that we could not fully make our own. Public hygiene, public education, amelioration of the condition of the working class by the help of the trade union demands, assistance to the needy by the municipality rather than by private institutions of "charity," all these are problems which we would gladly solve under the present system if the capitalists would only let us. And if Socialists will be elected to municipal offices, they will certainly voice the sentiments of the Socialist Party in this way and assist any other political party that will sincerely advocate them to the best of their powers. Senator Patterson of Colorado, in arguing that we do not permit any of our party members to vote for any other political party, did not see that there is nothing to prevent any of our elected candidates from voting in favor of any measure which Mr. Patterson should be willing to introduce "for the benefit of the working class."

In conclusion, let us remember that other and more vital problems are being pushed to the front in this country. In giving due consideration to municipal questions, let us not forget that the most "immediate demand" and immediate problem is the conquest of the political powers by the class conscious proletariat. Let us remember that the rural proletariat is waking up to a consciousness of its true condition and to the only solution of its servitude, and that we cannot afford to be simply a party of and for the city proletariat, at this stage, when nine-tenths of the population are practically proletarians.

We must define our position on these questions. But in defining them, we can choose the form of a resolution, the same as we did on the trade union, the negro and the injunction question. Such a resolution is as good a campaign document as a platform, and does not lead to the confusion which the immediate demand tail has caused in our platform. The issue to be fought out in this or the next presidential election will be Capital versus

Labor. Let us go into that fight with a platform that makes this issue and relegates all other demands to their proper position in a resolution to be used for municipal campaigns alone. And let our national platform be a simple declaration of war between Capitalism and Socialism.

Ernest Untermann.

A Short Cut.



ALTER THOMAS MILLS needs but fifty words to tell what one must believe in to be a Socialist, and ten will do—free access to collectively owned and managed means of production.

Two words name the object sought—equal opportunity.

One word may answer later—equality.

Socialists in every country are, by means of association and education, striving to break down the political and industrial barriers between them and their goal.

In each country the Socialists of that country seek to free themselves by attacking, with a thin skirmish line, the strong and fully manned section of the capitalistic stockade with which they are in immediate contact.

This is, after all, but a section of a continuous fence within which the workers of all countries are penned.

Is it necessary to overthrow this fence throughout its entire length in order to escape?

Is there not a short cut?

Will not a single breach suffice?

Can not the prisoners of all countries unite, if not their votes at least their purses, in one concerted, irresistible rush upon a single section of this stockade?

Will this not open a way of escape for *all* much sooner than the present plan of undermining the supports throughout the whole world? Can private capitalism long stand, anywhere, after the establishment of *one* great Co-operative Commonwealth?

If the point of attack is wisely selected, a country having the natural resources necessary for the support of a much larger population than it now has, will not the inducements it can hold out to the workers of other lands quickly disrupt the profit system elsewhere? If not, why not?

All who were able would go to the Co-operative Commonwealth at once, and those who could not would become Socialists in short order, owing to the combined effects of the object lesson and the direct help given other Socialists by the first grateful beneficiary of the "trust" method of International Socialism.

Is the idea not eminently practical—and feasible?

If so, let us apply it.

Let the Socialists of the world determine the best country to begin with, carefully weighing all conditions, and then let us all join in creating a World Fund, contributing liberally, regardless of what country may be selected.

Only in some such way can we demonstrate our sincerity in our assertions that Socialism is a world movement, and our sagacity in perceiving (in case some other country is selected) that the longest way round may be the shortest way out.

Surely we could contribute an average of at least two dollars each yearly to such a fund—this would mean ten million dollars a year. Would this sum not do wonders in Germany, France, Italy—or here? Let us rise to the plane of private capitalism at least—that plane already overlooks national frontiers—let us view the whole battle field, not confine our view to merely local aspects of the fight. If the victory can be won more quickly by a radical change in the disposition of our forces and point of attack, let us *be* radical.

George W. Rives.

Is it a Short Cut?

THERE is no doubt but every Socialist would welcome a short cut if he was sure it would lead to the co-operative commonwealth. I am not certain, and I think many Socialists will share my misgivings that the Comrade has not discovered a by-path ending in a capitalist morass rather than a short cut to Socialism.

Capitalism is not a stockade as he would picture it from which we are trying to escape, it is a system which is destined to be transformed by the intelligent action of the proletariat to a higher social stage which we call the co-operative commonwealth. It cannot be transformed piecemeal but must be transformed as a whole. This does not mean transformed at once; the transformation may take a long time, but the entire organism will be affected.

He asks: "Can private capitalism long stand anywhere after the establishment of one great commonwealth?" Let us turn this round and ask, Can one little co-operative commonwealth stand anywhere while private capitalism dominates the major portion of the earth?

The victory of the proletariat to be effective must be by a class-conscious proletariat, that is, an intelligent proletariat conscious of its mission and the means to its accomplishment. This demands the widest possible education, and to my mind it is one of the greatest reasons for rejoicing that up to the present time Socialism has shown no signs of concentration. There is no country of which it can be distinctly said that it is in every respect far in advance of several other countries. It is only because of this fact that when the proletariat gains the victory in some one country capitalism as a whole is doomed. If the efforts of the Socialists were concentrated in advance upon some one country, to the exclusion of others, the capture of the favored country would simply invite the violence of the capitalist countries and would mean that the whole struggle would need to be gone over again. At least this is the way the facts appear to me, and it is a question of the interpretation of facts and not of abstract theories.

A. M. Simons.

Don't Go to a Convention—Go to Work.

THERE are two general tendencies in the Socialist party, the one to organize a political party with the supreme authority of the party not only vested in the membership but continuously administered by the membership of the party; the other, to organize a sort of military organization under the pretence of organizing a political party, with all authority vested in a committee, the rank and file to have no voice except in a case of appeal, and then a referendum is to be regarded as in some way an attack, or at least a reflection, upon the committee and those asking for the referendum to be counted as kickers or rebels.

The Socialist party has grown with such rapidity in the last year that it is admitted now that this increase of Socialist votes is the most striking political event in the last forty years. This increase has been secured by the circulation of literature, by the holding of public meetings, by a campaign which has been carried on by local committees, by men who have secured subscribers to Socialist papers, circulated Socialist books, worked in a hand-to-hand way with their friends and neighbors arguing the merits of Socialism and multiplying the strength of the Socialist movement.

The Socialist movement and the Socialist party were never so strong as to-day. But the complaint is continually made by a small group of the Socialists acting under the leadership of certain members of the National Quorum, that there is something fatally defective in the organization of our party. The constitution of the party requires a semi-annual report of the standing and strength of the organization. The National Quorum recently published what claimed to be such a report. It is not my purpose to criticize this report, but only to call attention to the fact that the information contemplated by the constitution was not given but that instead a general argument was made, for holding a national convention to revise the constitution and not to hold the January meeting of the National Committee in accordance with the constitution. The complaint against the constitution is based upon the assumption that it gives the National Committee too little power.

The secretary of the quorum has been asked to state the substance of the amendment required, with the assurance from the friends of State autonomy that any amendment necessary to secure the enforcement of the constitution and the defense of the platform and the national party within the several States would be supported unanimously by the friends of State autonomy. But

he has refused to submit for the consideration of the committee, or anyone else, the form of the amendment asked for.

In the meantime an agitation has been going on from St. Louis, and at least one letter has been written from the National Headquarters defending the DeLeon program and the DeLeon tactics and insisting that our party must adopt and follow the model of the Socialist Labor party.

The National Committee voted against recommending a National convention, because there are no questions relating to the growth or the government of the Socialist party which cannot be handled either by a committee or by means of the referendum.

But what about State autonomy? If the change desired by the National Quorum is that no literature shall be circulated, no public meetings held, no propaganda be carried on in any State except under the direction of the National Quorum; and if it means that all local disputes within the party shall be subject to an appeal to and an adjustment by the National Quorum; then it ought to be stated that there is not a respectable fraction of the Socialists of this country that would submit to such a program.

The best people to adjust local differences are the people who are on the ground and know all about them. The best place to raise funds for campaign purposes is in the neighborhood where the campaign is to be carried on; the best people to expend this money are the people who are able to raise it; the best test of the value of any propaganda work, or of any literature or the various Socialist papers, is not whether they have the trade-mark of the St. Louis quorum, but whether the comrades are able to use them in their local work in such a way as to produce results; and the comrades themselves should be the judges as to the value of the service rendered by speakers, papers or other documents.

What is wanted is not one hundred delegates in a national convention. What is wanted is one hundred thousand Socialists talking with their neighbors, circulating literature, holding public meetings, and getting subscribers for the party press.

The National Committee in its session nearly a year ago directed the National Secretary to prepare blanks and to arrange for reports from individuals to their locals, from locals to the secretaries of the States, and from the States to the National Committee. And the secretary was instructed to publish monthly a summary of these reports in order that the party work might be so stimulated, and the whole body of the party membership set to work to make the Socialist party the ruling party in American politics. It was also voted that a list of national speakers be prepared; nominations were to be made by the members of the National Committee, a referendum to all the members of the committee be taken and the men set to work. The nominations were

made, the referendum was taken, *but the men so elected have not yet been notified of their election.* But a general circular was issued to the effect that the National Quorum could not make appointments for the speakers elected and declared further that the speakers so elected must not make use of the fact that they had been so elected as a means to secure appointments on their own account.

I think the blanks ought to be prepared and their use encouraged. I think these speakers ought to be set to work. If there are not funds to employ them, they should at least be permitted to employ themselves. They are doing so anyway. I do not think an amendment to the constitution is necessary to accomplish these results. I am persuaded that all that is necessary is an amendment to the understanding which the National Quorum has of its own duties.

There have been no troubles in Utah, nor in Nebraska, nor in North Dakota, nor in Kansas—all of which States have been giving the Local Quorum trouble—there has been no trouble in any of these States which in any way indicates the necessity of changing the constitution. There have been some slight difficulties which would suggest the wisdom of certain changes at St. Louis. But a National Convention will not be necessary to attend to this. All that will be needed will be a meeting of the National Committee. The National Quorum advises the National Committee not to meet. As a member of the committee I am unwilling to accept the advice. It advises instead a National Convention to revise the constitution. It will be time to accommodate the National Quorum with a new constitution when it shall have once gone to work performing its duties under the constitution as it is.

No two members of the quorum ought to be members of the same local in any State. Not more than two members of the quorum should be residents of the same State. The constitution was drawn especially in such a way as to make possible the organization of the Local Quorum in this way.

It was the purpose of the Chicago comrades, had they won the National Headquarters, to have Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana and Illinois represented on the Local Quorum. When the National Committee gets together and frankly discusses the situation, I am sure there are no difficulties which cannot be adjusted.

The duty of the hour is to make one hundred thousand more Socialists between this and the January meeting, and then make a half-million more before the next election, and to make these members of the party after a plan which will make a LOCAL REBEL and a NATIONAL BOSS alike impossible.

Walter Thomas Mills.

A Correction.

Berlin W. 30, Oct. 25, 1902.

To the Editor of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW:

Dear Sir: In your latest issue the writer of the article, "How Much Have the Trusts Accomplished?" after having quoted a letter of Mr. S. N. D. North saying that in almost all the great lines of industry the tendency is to a decrease in the number of separate establishments, etc., continues: "Yet those are all assertions, the truth of which a Bernstein will contest."

I am rather loth to reply to misrepresentations, be they ever so wild, but for once an exception may be permitted, and so I venture to ask the writer of the above to kindly let me know where "a Bernstein" has uttered words which would justify such a conclusion. Surely not in the much-attacked book, "Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus." For if my opponent proceeds to read there the chapter on the evolution of industrial establishments he will meet the following sentence:

"If the incessant progress of technical methods and centralization in a growing number of branches of industry is a *truth, the significance of which even blockheaded reactionists scarcely hide from themselves to-day*, it is a truth not less established that in quite a number of trades small and medium establishments prove to be perfectly able to live at the side of great establishments. Also in industry there is no pattern of evolution of equal validity for all trades" (I. c. pp. 52-58).

This is the statement the truth and bearing of which I have tried to convey to the readers of the book. Whether the statistics I have adduced for its support are scientific or not may remain undiscussed here. But it may be said that the criticisms directed against them have so little shaken my convictions in the truth of what I have written on the subject that when I prepared the new edition of the before-named book I have seen no reason to alter even a single sentence in this respect, nor can the facts upon which your contributor bases his conclusions modify this conviction. I can heartily endorse what Mr. North says without in the slightest degree contradicting my own statement.

I hope, sir, you will find space enough to insert these lines in your esteemed review. In case you should take some greater interest in the subject you will find a reference to it and the opinion of some statisticians of renown in the preface to the new edition of the book in question.

Believe me, my dear sir and comrade, faithfully yours,

Ed. Bernstein.

EDITORIAL

Socialism in the Election.

The Socialists are about the only ones who have any particular reason for rejoicing over the results of the recent election. The Republican party, though nominally victorious, finds its majority cut down, while the growing Socialist vote in such States as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania warns them that Mark Hanna's prophecy will soon be realized, and that the defenders of plutocracy will in the Socialist party find a new and much more powerful enemy than the old. Meanwhile the Democratic party has well-nigh ceased to be an active factor in American political life. With almost as many different platforms as there were States in the Union it made little headway on any of them. Perhaps it did the best where it came the nearest to fooling the people into believing it was entering on the road to Socialism.

At the present moment Massachusetts leads the Socialist column. Her greatly increased vote and her added representation in the Legislature, where Comrade Wallace C. Ramsden, of Brockton, goes to add his efforts to those of Comrades Carey and Macartney in shaking up the plutocratic bones in the Massachusetts Legislature entitle her to this place. In this connection we believe it is much more than a coincidence that Massachusetts has the lowest percentage of illiteracy of any State in the Union. When we combine highly developed capitalism with an intelligent proletariat the result is Socialism just as surely as a combination of fire and water will produce steam.

The great coal strike in Pennsylvania, combined with active propaganda and general economic advance, has placed that State alongside of New York in the struggle for the second place in the Socialist column. Illinois has forged ahead almost as rapidly as either of the other two States, and Chicago is only a little behind Greater New York in the number of Socialist votes and is far ahead of any other city in the United States.

Ohio must also be reckoned among the States which gives particular cause for gratification. For several years this State has been the center of all kinds of political freakism, but while Johnson and Jones were doing much to make Socialism ridiculous, they were nevertheless attracting the attention of the world, and the real thing was bound to come along not far behind. The remarkable growth of the Socialist party in Ohio indicates that from now on counterfeit Socialism will be at a discount in that State. Because of the clearness with which the line has been drawn in this State some rather significant tests of

loyalty to Socialism were offered. Among those who broke down beneath the test was the Clarion Club of Cincinnati, which has claimed the name of Socialism and has been looked upon as part of the Socialist army, but at the last moment betrayed the cause for which it claimed to stand by indorsing the Democratic ticket. In spite of this fact, however, Cincinnati raised her vote from 1,141 in 1900 to 4,500.

Wisconsin is another State which has forged to the front, being now among the foremost of any State in the Union as to percentage of Socialist votes to total votes cast. Throughout the West there was a remarkably high percentage of increase. In Colorado and Montana particularly the vote was multiplied many fold.

In this we see, of course, the work of the American Labor Union, although there is no doubt but what the country was ripe for Socialism and had been for some little time.

It has been noted by some of the Socialist papers that one very gratifying feature of the election was that the vote showed no sign of concentration. With the exception of the Black Belt of the South, there is scarcely a State in the Union which does not show a large increase. The National Executive Committee now announce that they are arranging to send an organizer into the Southern States, and we may expect to see these in line for the election of 1904. In connection with this fact there is another sign of equal importance, and that is that the growth everywhere shows signs of being a steady, healthy development. There have been very few sudden leaps and no absolute loss.

The capitalist press of the country have been startled by the strength shown by the party in this election. In Massachusetts especially the consternation has been great. But throughout the country there is evidence that "the conspiracy of silence" is about over.

Several attempts have been made to draw conclusions from the vote as to tactics. It seems to us that no valuable conclusion can be drawn in this regard. The Wisconsin comrades declare their large vote to be a triumph for the opportunist position, while some of the other papers note with great satisfaction that the vote was heavier in those localities where the party maintained the most uncompromising attitude. In California a distinctly new line of tactics was adopted. The Socialist party practically fused with the Independent Labor party, and high hopes were held out as to the great increase of votes that this would bring. We believe that it is very fortunate for the Socialist party as a whole that these expectations were rudely shattered. The vote in California is perhaps as disappointing as that of any in the Union, and it is disappointing in just those localities where we were led to expect so much. Without further knowledge as to local conditions we do not care to enter further into the subject. But from this distance it looks as though the Union Labor party had delivered their indorsement to the Socialists and their votes to the Democrats, and that once more fusion has ended in confusion.

In addition to the election of another member of the Massachusetts Legislature, an Alderman, Mr. Ben R. Cushman, was elected in Saginaw, Mich., while township officers were elected in Canton, Kansas, and San Diego County, California. In Oakland, California, several

officers, including some members of the Assembly, were elected on the fusion ticket.

In Deer Lodge, Montana, the entire ticket of an independent labor party was elected upon a Socialist platform. This included five members of the legislature and local officials. Since election the entire organization has been turned over to the Socialist party. A grand rally was held, and it was decided that from now on the entire energies of the previous organization should be devoted to the building up of the Socialist party.

The general complaint from all over the country is that Socialist votes were thrown out. This was particularly true of Colorado, Texas and California. In the latter State the judges of election made a decision that all votes containing marks in the "no nomination" blank should be declared defective and thrown out, and it so happened that the Socialists were the only ones that were hurt by this. We would suggest that this might have been obviated had the comrades in California filled out their tickets instead of making deals with another party. Texas does not yet have a complete Australian ballot system, and this makes fraudulent counting much easier.

We give herewith a table of the Socialist vote, as accurate as we can get it up to the present time. It is compiled from the reports of the Socialist papers and of individual reports from these States; wherever the official count is available it has been used. But in the majority of States the count has not been completed, or has not been published in such a way that we could obtain it, hence there are probably some errors in the table. However, enough information is now out to make it certain that the vote of the Socialist party will be somewhere between two hundred and forty and two hundred and fifty thousand, and will probably reach the latter figure.

The Socialist Labor party probably polled about fifty thousand more. An interesting fact about this party is that where it made the least propaganda it received the most votes. This, of course, simply shows that it needs only to be known to be killed. In Chicago it did not hold half a dozen meetings, and has practically no organization whatever, yet they received over 5,000 votes. The closest questioning by the Socialist party in this city have, as yet, failed to find anyone who voted their ticket intentionally. In all cases the votes were intended for the Socialist party. The probability is that had it not been for mistaken ballots they would not have received more than five or six hundred votes. The same thing was proved to a large degree in other States.

As is always the case with Socialist movements, an increased vote is the signal for increased activity in organization. From almost every State in the Union comes reports of new Locals and plans for extensive organization during the coming winter. This is really the most important work at this stage. If organization is perfected to correspond with the vote that we now have, the Socialist party should go into the campaign of 1904 with good prospects for capturing some of the States and putting several members into Congress:

	Vote in 1900.	Vote in 1902.
Alabama	200

Arizona	800
California	7,554	9,250
Colorado	654	10,000
Connecticut	1,029	3,000
Delaware	57	600
Florida	601	1,200
Idaho	1,000
Illinois	9,687	20,167
Indiana	2,374	7,134
Iowa	2,778	6,360
Kansas	1,605	3,236
Kentucky	646	2,500
Maine	878	1,974
Maryland	908	1,100
Massachusetts	9,607	33,609
Michigan	2,826	5,000
Minnesota	3,065	10,000
Missouri	6,139	8,500
Nebraska	832	3,171
Montana	708	5,000
New Hampshire	790	1,032
New Jersey	4,609	6,000
New York	12,869	25,000
North Dakota	518	1,200
Ohio	4,847	14,270
Oklahoma	1,963
Oregon	1,466	5,000
Pennsylvania	4,831	21,910
Rhode Island	1,091
South Dakota	176	1,500
Tennessee	710	900
Texas	1,841	5,000
Utah	720	3,000
Washington	2,006	5,000
West Virginia	600
Wisconsin	7,065	18,000

We note with great satisfaction the election of Comrade Max S. Hayes as one of the fraternal delegates of the A. F. of L. to Great Britain. Hitherto American labor has had cause to blush for the men it has sent abroad as its representatives, especially when they were compared with the exceedingly able men who were sent to this country. But in Comrade Hayes we have one who will adequately represent American labor. His election is also a decided victory for Socialism, because he has always stood so firmly for the Socialist movement that his election is to a large degree an indorsement of the Socialist position. The press reports state that his election was received with thunderous applause. It is one more reason for gratification by Socialists over the results of the convention at New Orleans.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Russia.

The following "secret" circular of the minister of war, A. Kuropatkin, speaks for itself:

To the Commanding Officer of the District Troops—

Dear Sir: The attempts of the political agitators to carry their propaganda into the army, which were formerly of rare occurrence, have greatly augmented of late and reached such a degree of insolence that I consider it of the highest importance to direct your attention to them.

The reports of the commanding officers and of the ministers of the interior and of justice show that proclamations were distributed during May, 1901, in the barracks of the 116th Malojarslav infantry. During the same month the captain of the staff of the 141st Moshajski infantry received two pamphlets entitled, "Politics and the Officers" and "Abolition of the Standing Army," the contents of which were highly seditious. During August of the same year all officers of the 27th infantry division received proclamations of a Wilna group of Socialists entitled, "To the Officers," in which the officers were blamed for becoming the executioners of "honest workingmen" at the command of their superiors, and in which they were entreated to renounce this "nefarious role." A copy of this proclamation was later (February, 1902) sent by mail to the officers of the Moscow garrison, and the officers' sharpshooting school received them by the same agency. In January, 1902, the sub-lieutenant, Teljminov, of the 9th Siberian grenadiers received a letter which attacked the government and incited the soldiers to refuse military service. It was furthermore ascertained that during the same month a dangerous letter entitled, "The Soldier's Lord's Prayer" had been written by hand and multiplied by lithography in the bureaus of the government, in which the soldiers were incited against their superiors. This letter was distributed among the soldiers of the 65th Moscow regiment of His Majesty, the 66th Butyrski regiment, and the 21st Bjelorussian dragoons. In February and March the officers of the Petersburg garrison received proclamations calling upon them to join the students and make political demonstrations together with them. In April the officers of the Wilna garrison again received proclamations of the "Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia," in which they were asked to join the "pan-Russian revolutionary movement." During the same month there were found in the courts of the barracks of the Krassnojarsk garrison proclamations of the "Siberian Social Democratic Organization," entitled, "To the Troops of the Krassnojarsk Garrison," and calling on the troops not to use their rifles against their brothers, the peasants and laborers who were fighting

for a just cause. In the same April and May a large number of leaflets entitled, "To the Soldiers," inciting to disobedience against the Tsar and to an overthrow of the government, were distributed among the privates of the 13th infantry division. Furthermore, personal attempts of the agitators to influence the privates of the same division were observed, and it was found that many of the agitators were privates in the marine corps stationed in Sebastopol. In March, 1902, an organized propaganda was discovered among the privates of the Jekaterinoslav grenadiers, which did not originate from people outside of the army, but from the privates themselves. At the head of this organization stood Private Alschanski, of the above-named regiment, a man of noble birth, who on being drafted into the service had purposely waived his right to short service for the sake of making propaganda among the privates. During his term Alschanski has carried on an energetic propaganda for the revolutionary ideas, by personal conversation with the privates, and by distributing a great number of pamphlets, proclamations and other publications. Some privates have directly assisted him in this criminal work, others have been guilty of not preventing and not reporting these doings. It is also worthy of special mention that among those guilty of causing the agrarian disturbances in the southern governments there was a sub-lieutenant of the 133d Sympheropol regiment, named Passjko, who was proven to have distributed pamphlets and proclamations of a vicious nature among the peasants of the Poltava government, and confessed his guilt.

These examples will certainly not exhaust the instances of revolutionary propaganda recently found in the army. There is reason to believe that many cases have not only remained unknown to the higher instances, but also to the local authorities, thanks to the well-known caution and conspiracy of the "underground" agitators. But the examples mentioned show clearly enough that the revolutionary and Socialist groups are strenuously active in spreading their ideas among the soldiers. This is not only evident from the mailing of seditious literature to officers and privates, but also from the fact that many agitators were in active service for the purpose of personal propaganda.

Considering it a matter of highest importance for the state to preserve the army against those false political doctrines, I have ordered the supreme military court to earnestly weigh the question of suppressing the sad phenomena mentioned above, and I also consider it my duty to request your honor to give me your opinion as to the means which you regard as the most necessary and practical.

Germany.

The struggle of the minority parties against the "hunger tariff" of the agrarian and clerical majority is raging fiercely in the Reichstag. The Socialists are using their best efforts to defeat the robbing schemes of the exploiters by all legal means, but as yet the majority is too strong and too sure of its power to abandon their insolent attitude. There are unmistakable signs that the agrarians will finally make a compromise with the government and accept a somewhat lower tariff than originally demanded by them. At the same time, the majority is

trying to walk roughshod over all parliamentary rules and to carry its demands by brutal force. The Socialists are obstructing this propaganda of the deed in every legal way possible, discussing every article of the tariff with minute care, and holding the speaker's stand for hours. Comrade Antrick proved a thorn in the agrarian side by speaking for three and a half hours, and Comrade Stadthagen aggravated them still more by holding the platform for four and a half hours. Still, the ultimate acceptance of the tariff can hardly be averted. The final verdict will rest with the people.

How this verdict would be if the German workingmen had the advantage of a just suffrage, is not doubtful. The recent Landtag's elections have again shown unmistakably in what direction the political wind is blowing. In Oldenburg, the Socialists gained five new seats, making a total representation of six. In Schwarzburg Rudolstadt, the Socialists now hold eight of the sixteen seats, and no law can be carried into effect without their consent. In Mayence, the two old mandates were maintained by the Socialists with 2,987, against 1,379 clerical and 690 liberal votes. In Offenbach, the Socialists received a majority of 400. In Heilbronn, Wurtemberg, the Socialists won with 2,577 against 2,397 capitalist votes. Two Socialist councillors were elected in each of the little towns of Eisenberg and Schmolln. Dusseldorf, a clerical stronghold, for the first time saw the Socialists take part in a Landtag election and was "thrilled to the bone" by seeing them rout all other parties with the exception of the clericals, whose candidates must now try a second ballot against the Socialists under conditions that make a clerical victory by no means certain. In Glessen, the Socialists made their first appearance in Landtag politics and polled 334 votes, against 686 of the capitalist parties.

While the hunger tariff is thus opening the eyes of the German workingmen to their class interests, the effects of the commercial crisis are still felt in all parts of the empire. The "Herbergen," those proletarian hostelries of the wandering and employment-seeking workers, gave shelter to 2,690,632 of them for 3,590,254 nights of the past year, or 25 per cent more than the previous year. The number of journeymen without means of support increased 37.5 per cent, while 12.92 per cent more paid for their board and lodging in the "Herbergen" than during the previous year. Not less than 759,057 destitute men begged for a night's lodging at those places. The employment agencies connected with those hostelries found work for only 108,505 men.

The following Associated Press dispatch adds some more unwilling testimony to the hypocrisy of capitalism:

Berlin, Nov. 25.—The Socialist organ, Vorwaerts, in a page and a half to-day deals with what it calls the "hypocrisy of idealizing Herr Krupp as a benevolent genius." The paper does not touch on the immediate charges which it brought against the decedent, but analyzes the pension system of the Krupp firm, which, it says, is a "species of refined swindling," adding:

"The enormous so-called benevolent funds have been built up by compulsory contributions from the employes, who could be deprived of participation in the advantages. They are required to contribute 2½ per cent of their wages for twenty years be-

eligible to a pension upon disability. In the meantime, if an employe is discharged or resigns, he loses all he has contributed, often exceeding \$250.

"The employes are morally and economically terrorized and must in humility accept every petty regulation of the firm's officials or lose 2½ per cent of what they have earned in the firm's service. This terrorism is applied to political opinions where they become known.

"The number of men leaving or discharged during the past three years averaged 7,000 to 8,000 yearly. The employes found the system so unsatisfactory that five great meetings were held this year for the purpose of seeking legal redress."

The paper also quotes the German budget committee proceedings as showing that the Krupp works have been charging the navy \$100 per ton above what the United States pays for nickel-steel plates, amounting yearly to \$750,000 for Herr Krupp and the Sturm works. The attack on Herr Krupp and the intense sensation which they have created have caused a furious political discussion, the Socialists calling attention to the "degenerating influence of great wealth" and the Conservatives pointing out "the desperate character of the Socialist attack upon the existing order of society."

France.

The general strike of the French miners closely followed the course of the American miners' strike, even to the point of an arbitration committee appointed by Premier Combes. It was also the object of a two days' debate in parliament. Comrades Jaures and Basly illustrated the injustice of the coal barons by abundant statistical material and showed conclusively that there was not the least necessity for the reduction of wages that was the immediate cause of the strike. From the beginning of 1898 to the middle of 1900 the average price of coal had almost doubled. The dividends of the coal barons increased from 40 millions in 1898-99 to 60 millions in 1899-1900, and to 105 millions the next year. Besides, they saved 180 millions per year for the reserve fund. The wages of the strikers, partly raised by the help of strikes, increased 11 millions in 1899, 21 millions in 1900, or in all from 183 to 215 millions. But at the same time the number of workers increased by 5,000 in 1899 and 9,000 in 1900, and during these two years the increase of day's works was 3,213,000 over that of previous years, or a total of \$15,000,000 more for additional workers, so that the actual increase of wages was only \$17,000,000. But the profits of the coal barons were 245 millions. These figures could not be disputed by the corporations, and they contented themselves with upbraiding the government for not protecting the "right to work" of the scabs. This was, however, mere subterfuge, for the government had not only sent them ample military protection, but the soldiers and gendarmes also acted as "pullers-in." The government tried to persuade the strikers to go back to work. Some of the police overstepped their authority, shooting strikers without strong reason. The Socialists made this a subject for an interpellation. There are no dissenters in the government, but the chamber passed a vote of confidence, in compromise with the ministerialists, with seven exceptions, joined. than originally

The revolutionary Socialists introduced the following resolution, which was defeated, Millerand abstaining from voting: "The Chamber condemns the armed intervention of the government in strikes, as it is directed entirely against the strike and the strikers on the pretense of protecting the right to work. The government is requested to withdraw the troops at once. The Chamber resolves to consider the questions involved in the strike (eight-hour day, minimum wage, and old age pensions) during the present session in the interest of the miners."

The committee of arbitration rendered such flagrantly unjust decisions that the majority of the miners voted to continue the strike and demand new negotiations.

Italy.

A series of bloody conflicts between striking peasants and gendarmes have thrown the press of the country into a state of excitement which threatens to lead to serious disturbances. The investigations made by a committee of Socialist representatives show that the gendarmes fired from ambush without being threatened by a crowd, and that they simply murdered the strikers. It has also been found out that the news about the recent occurrences in Giarratana, Sicily, passed through the hands of the prefect Modica, who acted as censor and destroyed all evidence that might have been damaging to the gendarmes. There will be a lively discussion of these incidents at the opening of the legislative session, and signs are not wanting that there will be a pronounced difference of opinion between Turati and Ferri in regard to the position which should be taken by the Socialist representatives toward the government. Turati is trying to make capital for his pet tendency out of the occurrences, blaming, among others, Ferri for the spilling of the blood, on the plea that "revolutionary" propaganda leads to violence. According to his philosophy, quietism and opportunism are the only civilized means of Socialist propaganda. A recent Associated Press dispatch states that Ferri will be in favor of withdrawing the support of the Socialists from the present ministry.

Child labor is on the increase in Italy, as in all capitalist countries. In this case it is shown especially in the rural districts. Of 8,173,389 persons employed in agriculture, 617,326, or 7.5 per cent, are children. Of 73,399 persons employed in gardening, 3,743, or 5.1 per cent, are children. And of 244,452 employed in stock raising, 56,973, or 23.3 per cent, are children. Their wages range from 5 to 10 cents per day.

Switzerland.

The recent elections for the Nationalrath have resulted in the election of 7 Socialists. In 1899 this body consisted of 147 members. There were 84 Radicals, 32 Clericals, 18 Protestant Conservatives, 7 members of the Social Political Group, 4 Socialists and 2 Democrats. The increase of the population increased the membership to 167. Proportional representation has been a failure, from the Socialist standpoint, because the apportionment is made by the ruling majority, who do not give the minority their just dues.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION.

The twenty-second annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is now history. From every standpoint the assemblage was the greatest since the foundation of the organization. There were more delegates present, despite the fact that the convention was held at an extreme end of the country, than at any previous session; there were more trade union members represented than ever before, and the debates were more interesting, intelligent and tolerant than in former years.

Over one million workers were represented by three hundred and odd delegates, comprising the active spirits of the American labor movement. Their mission at New Orleans was to initiate plans to still further strengthen the organizations in the different trades, to untangle some of the knotty problems that had arisen as a result of the rapid growth of trade unions and the evolution in industry, and to legislate in a manner that would make it possible to present a united front to the common enemy—modern capitalism.

While the discussions at times waxed bitter and feeling ran high, still underneath it all was the fact that the different unions simply disagreed upon details and were sparring for advantages in order to acquire the necessary power to combat the combined capitalists for improved conditions.

The officers' reports showed a gratifying gain in membership during the past year, an increase in financial resources, and almost without exception every one of the hundred affiliated national unions reported steady advances in the matter of reducing the hours of labor and raising wages. In the last eleven months 1,024 charters were issued, of which number fourteen were to national unions, six to State branches, 127 to city central bodies, and the balance to trade and federal unions not eligible to join national organizations. Per capita tax was paid on an average of 1,025,300, against 265,800 members in 1897. The affiliated national unions issued 4,513 charters, and the total gain in membership was 283,827 in the year. The Federation's income for 1902 was \$144,498, against \$115,220 last year, and expenditures were \$119,086, against \$118,708 in 1901.

These figures prove that the Federation is in a prosperous condition, and from all appearances will continue to expand and wield a powerful influence in the industrial affairs of the nation. This happy situation is, of course, due to the genius or ability of no single individual or even organization, but must be credited to the efforts of hundreds, aye,

thousands, of energetic workers and unions, not to speak of the economic forces that have compelled and fostered organization.

The paramount questions before the convention, that of jurisdiction of national unions and Socialism, were discussed with less friction than at previous sessions. Only once or twice were personalities indulged in, but the great majority of delegates plainly showed that they were not in sympathy with that sort of propaganda.

One of the surprises of the meeting was the injection of the Shaffer-Gompers imbroglio, which was expected to create a sensation at Scranton last year. President Shaffer, of the iron and steel workers, had charged President Gompers, of the A. F. of L., with bad faith and conduct unbecoming a union man. In specific terms, the latter was accused of meddling in the iron and steel workers' strike last year, and with deliberately lying in order to secure a settlement that would have been unfavorable to the men. Delegate Sheridan, of the iron and steel workers, introduced a resolution calling for an investigation, and a special committee of five was chosen to probe for the facts. After several days were spent in taking testimony, it developed that Shaffer had refused to substantiate his charges or furnish proof that Gompers had been guilty of wrongdoing, and the latter was vindicated. The matter will now go back to the iron and steel workers, who will be compelled to decide whether their president was right or wrong.

The trade autonomy or jurisdiction troubles, as outlined in the Review during the past few months, were all given their annual airing. The carpenters vs. woodworkers, brewers vs. engineers and firemen, seamen vs. longshoremen, molders vs. metal polishers, plumbers vs. electricians, woodworkers vs. piano makers, garment workers vs. tailors, et al., were before the court, discussed and cussed, and parties of the first and second part were told in so many words to settle their own grievances. Heretofore it has been the custom to refer the jurisdiction quarrels to the executive counsel for adjudication, but little has been accomplished by this policy. This year a few delegates held a quiet confab and evolved the scheme of getting the unions to practice what they preached—conciliation, arbitration and compromise. I do not mind mentioning the fact, now that the convention is over, that the writer pleads guilty to the charge of having a hand in hatching the plot and laying it before several other cantankerous Socialists (Slayton, Barnes and other wicked fellows who are watched as closely as a cat watches a mouse), and from the moment that the amalgamated and brotherhood carpenters were brought to the point of agreeing to settle their trade differences, the idea became popular, and no matter how the committees reported the grievances were referred, with but one or two exceptions, to commissions composed of equal numbers of members from the unions involved, and they to choose an unbiased umpire. The plan is experimental and may not result in bringing about harmony in all cases, but it is worth giving a fair trial. Under present laws the Federation has little power to force affiliated unions to obey its mandates. It may expel an organization, but that establishes a bad precedent and settles nothing. Indeed, to pursue such a course would simply invite disaster sooner or later.

The debate on Socialism was without doubt the one that created the

most general interest, and, despite the fact that President Gompers peevishly complained at the night session of the closing day that nearly a whole day's time had been wasted in "idle speculation," the delegates without exception agreed that the discussion of Socialism was the feature of the convention that stood out pre-eminent as the greatest from an educational viewpoint. Both the advocates and opponents of Socialism displayed uniform courtesy toward each other, and after the struggle was over there were no sore spots. Each side was satisfied—the anti-Socialists because they had won, and the Socialists because they had made a splendid showing and came close to being the victors.

The committee on resolutions reported that seven separate propositions advocating Socialism had been introduced, and, after some consideration, it had been decided to non-concur in all and reaffirm the declaration made at Scranton last year, viz., that the A. F. of L. is in full accord with the larger body of Socialists in this country in its aim to secure better conditions for labor, and that the unions and members thereof are urged to discuss political and economic questions, but to prohibit the introduction of partisan politics, which would tend to disrupt the organizations. Delegate Hayes, of the Typographical Union, anticipated the action of the committee and had prepared a substitute, which he attempted to introduce as such, but it was ruled out, despite the fact that the same delegate secured the consideration of a substitute for a committee report on the carpenters' jurisdiction question. The proposition was then offered as an amendment and entertained. It reads as follows:

"Whereas, Capital being the product of the past labor of all the toilers of the human race, and as wages can never be regarded as the full equivalent for labor performed, and that it is the mission of the trades unions to protect the wage-earners against oppression and to fully secure the toilers' disenthralment from every species of injustice; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this twenty-second annual convention of the American Federation of Labor advise the working people to organize their economic and political power to secure for labor the full equivalent of its toil and the overthrow of the wage system and establishing an industrial, co-operative democracy."

Delegate William B. Wilson, of the miners, amended to strike out all after the word "toil," which amendment was accepted by the author of the resolution. It mattered little what the wording of the amendment was. Socialism was the topic that was discussed by every delegate who took the floor, and none of the speakers took the time to split hairs on the question as to whether he would receive the full equivalent of his toil in an industrial, co-operative democracy or not. The adoption of the foregoing resolution as amended, the opposition declared, would commit the American Federation of Labor to Socialism and the Socialist party, and the battle raged along that interpretation. The anti-Socialists did not attempt to destroy the logic of those who favored the resolution. They contented themselves with the sweeping assertion that Socialism is speculative, an untried plan, while the trade unions are accomplishing something now, and for that reason the energies of the workers should not be divided by economic and political effort, but

all their time should be spent to make the unions more invulnerable. One speaker traced history from Moses down to date to show that the workers had never secured anything of lasting benefit with the ballot, and incidentally he demolished his own arguments by showing that the principal revolts of the Roman slaves, the Wat Tyler rebellion and other uprisings had also accomplished very little. Other equally illogical speeches were made. On the other hand, the Socialists made cleancut arguments in favor of co-operative production and the necessity of political solidarity. They explained that as a people we are in a new age, that with the development of the tool of production the worker has lost control of it, and therefore has lost his independence, and that the capitalists, by reason of having obtained possession of those tools and the land, are able to dictate wages and prices through their trusts and combinations and virtually enslave labor.

As before stated, the opposition did not attempt to controvert the logic of the Socialists, but played upon the fear that to indorse Socialism meant the injection of partisan politics in the unions, which would be resented by Republicans and Democrats and result in disruption. The Socialists, through the introduction of the amendment, were enabled to take an aggressive position. The speakers on their side were Max S. Hayes, of Cleveland; George Warde, of Erie, Pa.; J. H. Brower, Elgin, Ill.; James Wilson, of New York; John L. Compton, of Denver; William B. Wilson, of Indianapolis; Victor Berger, of Milwaukee; John P. Reese, of Iowa; Fred C. Wheeler, of Los Angeles; J. Mahlon Barnes, of Philadelphia, and J. W. Slayton, of New Castle, Pa., in the order named. Those who spoke against the amendment were T. J. Duffy, of East Liverpool, O.; John B. Lemon, treasurer of A. F. of L.; Lee Hart, of Chicago; Andrew Furnseth, of San Francisco; James Duncan, first vice president; Henry White, of New York; D. A. Hayes, sixth vice president, and Samuel Gompers. The roll call on the amendment resulted as follows: In favor, 4,203; against, 4,865. The report of the committee was thereupon adopted. And thus ended the greatest debate that has yet taken place in the Federation and which consumed almost six hours' time.

There were a number of other propositions that developed discussion along the lines of Socialism, as, for instance, Victor Berger's resolution favoring old age pensions, which was defeated on division by 90 to 85. The various resolutions on trade autonomy versus industrialism also opened the way for the exploitation of Socialist doctrines, enabling its advocates to point out the necessity of compact organization and united action, politically and economically, to throw off the yoke of capitalism and emancipate the working class.

The old officers were re-elected, although the carpenters made an unsuccessful attempt to dislodge Vice President Kidd by nominating their general secretary, Frank Duffy. Max S. Hayes, of the printers, and Martin Lawler, of the hatters, were elected fraternal delegates to Great Britain, and John Coleman, of the carpenters, won the delegateship to the Canadian Trades Congress after a spirited contest.

BOOK REVIEWS

Walt Whitman, the Poet of the Wider Selfhood. Mila Tupper Maynard. Charles H. Kerr & Company. \$1.00.

Mrs. Maynard, who is a well-known worker in the Socialist movement in Colorado, gives us in this book an important addition to Socialist literature. Beginning with "A Glimpse of the Man," we have a concise summary of the important facts in his life, and realize how much that life embraced of the universality that appears so often in his writings. This leads on to the second chapter, on "The Copious Personal Self," where we find that Whitman was one of the first to recognize what has since come to be known as the divinity of man. Under the heading of "The Cosmic Self" this thought is widened out into the broadest and clearest expression of the idea of unity and equality that has ever been expressed. Speaking of Whitman's wonderful prophetic power, the author says concerning the theory of evolution: "Nevertheless, had he been fully cognizant of every scientific fact and theory discovered or projected up to the moment of publication, his work would be quite as marvelous, so completely has the evolutionary universe become absorbed into his unconscious thought." But Whitman leaps even beyond organic evolution and refuses to be awed even by the triumphs of science.

Another side of this same subject follows in the chapters on "The Eternal Self," showing that with Whitman "Life is always seen by him with death at its side; but not as a ghastly skeleton—always as a promise and a benediction. Death to him means infinite potency—the guarantee of eternal meaning for all the events and realities of earth. Whatever death may mean, he includes it in his scheme of the universe, and fears it no more nor less than birth.

In the chapters on "Even These Least," "The Larger Woman," "The Larger Man," "Youth, Maturity, Age," we get still further views of Whitman, manifested by inclusive treatment of humanity. Like all the poets who protested Whitman was a nature lover, but he loved the city as well as the country, and both were natural to him. "Whitman's cosmopolitan enthusiasm is well illustrated in his equal appreciation of the peculiar attractions of each of the many parts of the nation.

"His thrilling delight in Mannahatta—his own New York—is no more intense than his homesick yearning for the South . . . California ideals and possibilities as well as its matchless skies have never been better voiced than by him. . . . The mountain States are not omitted. He speaks of 'their delicious rare atmosphere,' and of their 'mountain tops innumerable draped in violet haze,' and concludes: 'Yes, I fell in love with Denver, and even felt a wish to spend my declining and dying days there.' "

Of "Democracy" the writer says: "In this topic we reach the pivotal point of the enthusiasms of Walt Whitman. Every other element in his thought is in some way related to this principle—the equality and sacred value of every human being and a free life in society, based upon this equality and worth." His ideal of the greatest city is filled with the principles of social democracy and he cries out to "A Foiled European Revolutionaire:"

"Courage yet, my brother or my sister!

Keep on—Liberty is to be subserved whatever occurs."

With all his cosmopolitanism, he still loved America, which meant to Whitman "the incarnation of sovereign individuals associated in perfect democracy." In the final chapter on "Comradeship" the author sums up by saying: "The circle of Whitman's thought finds its perfect round in the idea of comradeship." Anyone who reads this work can agree with the closing paragraph, that "Whatever else Walt Whitman has tried to do, no one can doubt that he has written from the inmost sources of his life. He has tried to be all that nature would have him and give back to his larger self—all humanity—the life blood it loaned him."

The book is bound in beautiful art board, and is a delight to handle and to read. All told, it is a fitting cover to a fitting treatment of a great subject.

The New Empire. Brooks Adams. The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 243 pp. \$1.50.

One of the surest signs of the growth of Socialism is an acceptance of its basic principles by a great number of general writers on economic subjects.

The above work does not contain the slightest reference to Socialism, yet it is based almost entirely upon the materialistic conception of history. His introduction is a plea for courage to generalize in the social field as is now done in the field of natural science, because only through such generalization is a social science ever possible.

Economic domination has moved with the shifting of trade routes and the control of the essentials of economic life, particularly metals. While commerce moved almost exclusively along the shores of the Persian gulf upon the Euphrates, and the main seat of mining was the Arabian copper mines, Babylon grew and flourished. As the course of commercial exchange moved northward and other mineral sections to the west and north were discovered, Nineveh, Tyre, Sidon, Greece, and finally Rome, rose to power. With the decline of the Spanish mines and the growing importance of those of the Hartz mountains, coupled with the opening of the overland caravan route, and the great rivers of Russia, the seat of industrial and commercial activity and political control moved to the cities of the Hanseatic League, where these trade routes converged. While commerce still moved via the Mediterranean cities and through the Alpine passes, a number of great cities arose in the Adriatic and at the points of change along the land routes. Trade had thus begun to find other lines, either wholly by sea via Gibraltar, or through the Russian rivers, when Constantinople was captured and the Mediterranean route to Asia was cut off. As a result the cities of

the Mediterranean, Southern France and Germany fell in economic and political importance. The center of mineral production, so far as gold and silver were concerned, moved across the Atlantic, and a battle began between Spain and England, and later between France and England, to determine where the nerve center of this vastly greater commercial world should be located. England's more favorable geographical position, combined with the other advantages enumerated, gave her the victory, and improved methods of production in the industrial revolution enabled her to hold this dominating position almost until the present time. The coming of the railroad and modern conditions of production have shifted the whole mass of forces once more, and the struggle is now on between two great contending trade routes, one of which is represented by the United States and Japan, who are striving to have the world's exchanges take place across the Pacific and American Transatlantic railroads, while on the other side the nations of Continental Europe, headed by Russia, see their only hope of future importance in locating the trade routes of this same commerce across the Siberian railroad to Western Europe. In this struggle the author is inclined to think the victory will rest with Japan and the United States.

The work is full of important observations on things which are of somewhat minor interest, compared with the great central thought of the work.

The appendix contains a valuable summary of historical events and economic movements throughout the history of the world. Complete fairness would perhaps demand that the author give credit to Socialist sources for the theory upon which the book is based. But Socialists can well afford to pass over the question of individual credit in view of the extremely valuable contribution which is made to their propaganda.

Our Benevolent Feudalism. W. J. Ghent. The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 202 pp. \$1.25.

Few articles have attracted wider attention than that entitled "A Benevolent Feudalism," which appeared in the New York Independent for April 3, 1902. This book is an expansion and strengthening of the position there taken. The author sees evolving from our present society a stage of fixed status, with the industrial barons at the top and a regular gradation of the remainder of the population dependent upon them. Including railroad legislation, he finds that over fifteen billion dollars of the capital of the United States is already in the hands of a few financiers. At the same time the power of a few men in these great industries is constantly increasing, so that small stockholders are having less and less influence. The farmer and wage-worker is coming to have a fixed position in society out of which it cannot move, and which leaves him completely dependent upon the great industrial barons. But these industrial barons are continually becoming more and more "benevolent." Industrial villages like Pullman and Pelzer are increasing. Profit sharing, old age pensions, and general movements for "social betterment" are extending. The government becomes but a mere machine in the hands of the industrial masters. Labor legislation becomes less and less effective. For the last ten years there has been

practically no progress in this direction. "Bondage to the land was the basis of villeinage in the old regime; bondage to the job will be the basis of villeinage in the new."

All this is set forth in an extremely vivid and attractive manner, and it is this which gives the book its great power. The Socialist reading it indeed will in the first place be somewhat amazed at the lack of originality in the book, and this notwithstanding the fact that most reviewers have laid great stress upon its having this very quality. But, as a matter of fact, there is scarcely a position in it that is not set forth in "The Communist Manifesto," to say nothing of the other writings of Marx and Engels and the host of Socialist writers that have followed. Mr. Ghent sees but one side of the picture, the fact of class rule.

It is hard to tell whether his knowledge of Socialist literature is as scant as it would appear from the references which he gives. If he did have a wider knowledge, honesty should have led him to have given credit for most of his ideas.

But the Socialists have also seen the other side of the picture which is here omitted. They have seen that the Pullman and model establishments in general are as apt to be the centers of revolt as those less benevolently managed.

No account whatever is taken in the book of foreign competition, which has not by any means been eliminated, as yet, in this country. A great many of the authorities which he quotes and whose opinions he gives as to the attitude of the capitalist class belong to the past generation, as, for example, Godkin and Sumner, and far more quotations might be found to show the opposite of what he is attempting to prove. The whole book is written from a little capitalist class attitude, and when small bourgeois radicalism disappears, Mr. Ghent sees no hope of further resistance to exploitation. Indeed, it is hard to tell whether the author is not laughing at us all the time and does not see the impossibility of the fate he points out.

There is much about the book that reminds one of Professor Veblin's theory of the leisure class. At all events, it is well worth the reading, and is bound to have a great influence in breaking up the crust of a conservatism and making impossible any sort of "benevolent feudalism."

Career and Conversation of John Swinton. Robert Waters. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Paper, 84 pp. 25 cents.

Among the names of those who have made smooth the way for the Socialist movement in America there are few more prominent than that of John Swinton. A man of brilliant intellect, a personal friend of Karl Marx, an able linguist, a fighter in the actual battle of labor, and one of the most prominent journalists of the United States, his was pre-eminently a life of action and of doing. This life is told by a familiar acquaintance, a friend, who makes the man live before us.

The fact that the author has occasionally injected some comments on Socialism, which serve only to show he is not familiar with Socialist literature, does not detract from the value of the book as a historical document and as an extremely entertaining piece of writing.

Each month the mass of pamphlet literature grows larger, and the possibility of giving it even a mention becomes more and more impossible. Some of those that have come this month are particularly good.

First in the list as something unique and valuable is Ryan Walker's "The Social Hell." This is a series of cartoons, with running comment that should serve to rouse anyone to action into whose hands they might fall. In some respects it is one of the most valuable weapons yet added to the Socialist armory. It is published by "The Coming Nation" at Rich Hill, Mo., and sells for 25 cents. The Standard Publishing Co., of Terre Haute, Ind., have issued two pamphlets by Rev. T. J. Hagerty. The one on "Economic Discontent" is a splendidly written, clear-cut, neatly printed pamphlet that sells for ten cents, and should be circulated by the thousands everywhere. The other is "Why Physicians Should be Socialists," and is an example of a sort of special pamphlets of which we should have a great many more. Every Socialist Local should see to it that the physicians in their town are well supplied with copies. Only five cents. The Volkzeitung, of New York, has issued its well-known "Pioneer Kalendar" for 1903, filled with information which Socialists need to know and containing some excellent articles by some of the best writers on Socialism. Twenty-five cents. "Our Juggled Census Statistics," by H. L. Bliss, is "an exposure of the fallacious methods adopted at the present census for the purpose of misleading the public," and will be found worth reading by those who are interested in studies of the statistical method of reasoning. The author shows how the figures were juggled to make it appear that the condition of the wage-earner was improving. On the whole, his criticisms seem sound, but in his discussion of farm statistics he has discovered a "mare's nest" when he attempts to show that the great increase in farm acreage shown by the last census is due to the inclusion of garden patches as farms, for the whole number of farms under three acres was only 32,829, a number too trifling to have had any important effects. Ten cents. "La Legislation Ouvriere et l'Hygiene," by the well-known Socialist member of the French Chamber of Deputies, writer and Communeard, Edouard Vaillant, is a thorough study of the conditions affecting the health of the worker under capitalism and the efforts which have been made to improve those conditions. Twenty cents. "The Labor Problem," by Eugene P. Hourihan, is a fairly good presentation of the doctrines of Socialism and an argument for the adoption of the co-operative commonwealth, which ends with an appeal for "The New Democracy." Fifteen cents. C. L. James' "Origin of Anarchism" informs us that Burke, Godwin, Shelley, Byron, Jefferson, Paine, Emerson, Thoreau, Josiah Warren, Charles O'Connor, Condorcet, Marx, Bakunin, and several more equally well-known persons with equally diverse sentiments were among the founders of anarchy. Unfortunately he does not attempt to define this protean creature which he has named anarchy, and leaves the reader in hopeless confusion as to what it is all about. (If that last sentence sounds confused, remember it was written just after reading the book.) Published by "Free Society." Ten cents. "The Trust Problem," by Charles Fox, is an attempt to study the relation between the trusts and the tariff. While the author agrees that the Socialists are right and that the trust is destined to socialization, he proposes as present measure a sort of export duty to be manipulated in connection with the present tariff on imports for the control of the trusts.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

What Comrade Debs Thinks of "Britain for the British"

Robert Blatchford has chosen, as usual, a happy title for his new book. "Britain for the British," by Blatchford, is immensely suggestive and tells its own story. The name of this popular writer and powerful propagandist is known in all the zones that belt the globe. It is indissolubly linked with the Socialist movement. Robert Blatchford and Modern Socialism are so intimately associated in the popular mind that they have come to be regarded as synonymous terms. They are boon companions and loyal comrades; where the one is known, both are welcome.

Robert Blatchford seems divinely appointed to address the common people. He writes so clearly and so calmly, his language is so simple, his argument so conclusive and his manner so gentle, patient and impressive that it is not strange that the multitude hear him gladly and that the thousands, to paraphrase the old farmer in the dialect lines of James Whitcomb Riley, join eagerly in the tribute inspired in the heart's abiding love:

"Robert Blatchford, Robert Blatchford,
I venerate your name;
For the name of Robert Blatchford
And Socialism's just the same."

The new book is in all regards a worthy successor of "Merrie England," and all who have read this most widely circulated and best of all works in popular Socialist propaganda should also read "Britain for the British," a continuation of the former, in the same simple, convincing style which appeals to the John Smiths, and all the many millions of the working class in their own language and with such irresistible logic and force that in spite of themselves they are drawn from darkness into sunlight, giving eager approval to Socialist principles and hearty support to the Socialist movement.

The English edition of the book is from the Clarion press in London, the home of the versatile and virile weekly that is published by Mr. Blatchford and his colleagues in the propagation of International Socialism.

The American edition is from the press of C. H. Kerr & Co., Socialist publishers, is printed on good paper, in clear type, bound in red cloth, contains 173 pages, and sells at the reasonable price of 50 cents per copy.

The book is divided into nineteen chapters and contains a list of "What to Read." There is also an interesting "appendix," by A. M. Simons, editor of the International Socialist Review, opening with the

paragraph: "The American workingman will not find it very hard to see that the lesson of 'Britain for the British' applies with even greater force to the conditions of his own country."

As the title of the book may convey the inference that it is intended for the people of Great Britain only, or that it has special interest to them alone, it is well to say that while the book is addressed by the author to his own countrymen, it has equal interest for all the people and its logic has equal application to all the civilized countries of the earth.

The nineteen chapters of the book bear the following suggestive titles: "The Unequal Division of Wealth;" "What is Wealth, Where Does It Come From, Who Created It?" "How the Few Get Rich and Keep the Many Poor;" "The Brain Worker or Inventor;" "The Landlord's Rights and the People's Rights;" "Luxury and the Great Useful Employment Fraud;" "What Socialism Is Not;" "What Socialism Is;" "Competition vs. Co-operation;" "Foreign Trade and Foreign Food;" "How to Keep Foreign Trade;" "Can Britain Feed Herself?" "The Successful Man;" "Temperance and Thrift;" "The Surplus Labor Mistake;" "Is Socialism Possible and Will It Pay?" "The Need for a Labor Party;" "Why the Old Parties Will Not Do;" "To-Day's Work."

The keen analytical power of Mr. Blatchford is apparent in each chapter. He probes like a skilled surgeon to the very depths of capitalist production, exposes its inner workings and lays bare its incongruities and absurdities as well as its crimes and its cruelties.

Each chapter is an essay, and each essay the finished product of the clear thinker, the close and constructive reasoner, the terse and clever writer, the genuine humanitarian.

In referring to the title of the book the author says: "At present Britain does not belong to the British; it belongs to a few of the British, who employ the bulk of the population as servants or as workers."

That fits the United States precisely, and all of the rest of the great "powers" of the earth. They belong to the few; they are ruled by the few; they are exploited by the few, in each case the same "few" who constitute the aristocracy and look down upon the great mass as inferior beings, spawned to work, and produce, and propagate their species, and suffer—and die. This is the social state evolved from the capitalist system, and when the author says: "The remedy for this evil state of things—the only remedy yet suggested—is Socialism," he strikes a responsive chord in the breasts of ten millions of class-conscious Socialists who constitute the International Socialist Movement, and whose number is hourly increasing at such a rate that in the next few years they will become irresistible and by the power of their majority and the logic of events they will come into control of government everywhere, put an end to the iniquities of production for profit and wage slavery, and inaugurate the Socialist commonwealth.

The sixteenth chapter, "Is Socialism Possible, and Will It Pay?" and "The Need for a Labor Party" are in the author's happiest vein, full of clear and telling points, and ought to be read by every workingman and woman. The chapter last named is particularly commended to those who assure us that they believe in the "theory" of Socialism, yet imagine that it can be realized by adhering to some pro-

fessed "reform" or "liberal" or "democratic" party of reaction whose salvation depends upon favoring Socialism "theoretically" while defeating it at the ballot box.

This latest work of Robert Blatchford is a distinctive acquisition to the literature of International Socialism. It is an excellent exposition of Socialism up to date. The author has the keen insight of the social philosopher and his enunciation of Socialist principles rings true from the foreword to the close of the last chapter.

I have read "Britain for the British" with profit and delight; I thank Robert Blatchford for writing it, and commend it heartily to all people.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

Terre Haute, Indiana, October 15th, 1902.

"Capital"—By Karl Marx.

Last June we imported two hundred and fifty copies of this great work, the standard English edition, complete so far as it has yet been translated into English. This is the same edition which was and still is sold elsewhere at \$2.50. We fixed the retail price at \$2.00, with our usual discounts to stockholders, and the result was that the whole edition was exhausted in a very few weeks, while additional orders began to pile up. We placed an order for a second edition early in September, but owing to delays in binding and transmitting, our second edition was not received until late in November.

This edition was practically exhausted in filling orders received before it arrived. A third edition was, however, ordered in time and has now been received, so that we are ready to fill orders promptly. Copies will be sent to any address by mail or express prepaid for \$2.00; to our stockholders for \$1.20; to our stockholders by express at purchaser's expense for \$1.00. Remember, this is a handsome library edition in cloth binding, containing 847 pages, and is complete so far as yet translated. We are endeavoring to secure the \$2,000 needed to translate and publish the remainder of Marx's great work, and we hope to announce it definitely in two or three months.

Christmas a Socialist Festival.

Christmas is older than Christendom. How old we will not try to say, but the midwinter festival of peace and good will was an ancient custom at Rome when the first Christian church was founded there. The festival, celebrated by a nation of masters and slaves, was a glad-some reminiscence of the happy childhood of the race when there were no slaves and no masters. While it lasted, men were free to follow their natural impulses of love and good will, forgetting for a moment the distinctions of class.

Two thousand years have passed; still men are masters and slaves; still we have the Christmas festival of peace and good will; dimmer and dimmer has grown the twilight of the days of equality to which the people of Rome looked longingly back. But the Christmas spirit has lived in the hearts of the people and it mingles with the gladness of the dawn-thought. For the old order of class rule is crumbling, and the

workers are rising to a consciousness of the present struggle, the coming victory, the coming joy, the coming season of love and peace, when Christmas shall last the whole year through, because social relations will be such that those who follow the golden rule will no longer be crowded off the earth.

Christmas is then a prophecy of the new social order whose coming the Socialists of the world are working to hasten. And Socialists can celebrate it in no better way than by spreading the message of Socialism. In last month's Review, pages 316 and 317, we explained what our co-operative company has done to help the comrades to celebrate Christmas in this effective way. The new books named there were, Communist Manifesto, 10 cents; Walt Whitman, \$1.00; Gracia, a Social Tragedy, \$1.25; Resist Not Evil, 75 cents; Sombart's Socialism, \$1.00; Kautsky's The Social Revolution, 50 cents; Altgeld's Oratory, 50 cents. Others not there mentioned will now be described.

The Social Science Series.

This well-known series of books by famous writers is published by Swan Sonnenschein & Company of London. It contains over a hundred volumes by the most prominent writers of Europe. From these we have selected twenty that are really indispensable to any student wishing to gain a comprehensive knowledge of Socialism. The titles are as follows:

SINGLE NUMBERS, \$1.00 EACH.

Work and Wages. J. E. Thorold Rogers.
 Civilization; Its Cause and Cure. Edward Carpenter.
 Quintessence of Socialism. Dr. Schaeffle.
 Religion of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
 Ethics of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
 England's Ideal, etc. Edward Carpenter.
 Bismarck and State Socialism. W. H. Dawson.
 Story of the French Revolution. E. B. Bax.
 Evolution of Property. Paul Lafargue.
 German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle. W. H. Dawson.
 Outlooks from the New Standpoint. E. Belfort Bax.
 The Student's Marx. Edward Aveling, M. D.
 Ferdinand Lassalle. E. Bernstein.
 Parasitism: Organic and Social. Massart and Vandervelde.
 Revolution and Counter Revolution. Karl Marx.
 Overproduction and Crises. Karl Rodbertus.
 Village Communities in India. B. H. Baden Powell, M. A., C. I. E.

DOUBLE NUMBERS, \$1.25 EACH.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. F. Engels.
 Socialism; Its Growth and Outcome. W. Morris and E. B. Bax.
 The Economic Foundations of Society. Achille Loria.

We have imported fifty copies each of these twenty volumes, and while they last we can fill your orders promptly. Our stockholders can buy these books at the same discount as if they were published by ourselves.

Sombart's Socialism.

"Socialism," by Prof. Werner Sombart, Professor in the University of Breslau, is just the work to give a solid and thorough understanding of the fundamentals of Socialism. It lays stress on a vital point which is commonly omitted in publishing expositions of Socialism—the class struggle. It traces the evolution of classes to the present time and explains the economic forces now at work which are bound to bring in Socialism. The language is clear, simple, not scientific. It is just the work to give one who has recently begun to read on Socialism, and it is one of the best books for those who already believe in Socialism, but who want to get a good grip on its general principles.

The paper, the type and the binding are much handsomer than we are usually able to offer in Socialist books. The price has until lately been \$1.25, but we have recently secured control of the book and have reduced the price to \$1.00, postpaid, with the usual discount to our stockholders.

Love's Coming-of-Age.

The problem of the relation of the sexes is too subtle for a writer who is merely a scientist; he must be a poet as well, or he will be incapable of observing the facts with which his science must deal. On the other hand, if he is merely a poet he will be unable to make intelligent use of the facts he has grasped, and he will fail to point the way to any new truth. Edward Carpenter has the rare merit of being poet and man of science in one. He faces bravely the questions that prudes of both sexes shrink from, and he offers a solution that deserves the attention of the ablest leaders of popular thought, while his charmingly simple style makes the book easy reading for anyone who is looking for new light on the present and future of men and women in their relations to each other.

The book is daintily printed and bound in silk cloth with gold stamping. The price, including postage, is \$1.00.

More Capital in Sight—Still More Needed.

Since the first of September one hundred more shares of stock at \$10 each have been subscribed by readers of the International Socialist Review. This new capital has enabled us to bring out the new books described in the November and December numbers. Other equally important books are awaiting publication, and will be issued as soon as the necessary capital is secured. We have now 500 stockholders who have subscribed \$10 each. There are 500 more Socialists equally well able to help, who are only waiting for the right time. And a brief study of the situation will make it clear to them that the right time is now.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

Socialist Book

The condensed list on this page includes nearly every book in the English language which is for sale anywhere, published or imported by the co-operative publishing house.


Socialist Books in Cloth Binding.

AVELING, Edward. The Student's Marx	\$1.00	ALLI
BADEN-POWELL, B. H. Village Communities in India	1.00	BLAT
BAX, E. Belfort. Outlooks from the New Standpoint	1.00	B
—The Ethics of Socialism	1.00	BLIS
—The Religion of Socialism	1.00	BOUS
BERNSTEIN, Edward. Ferdinand Lassalle	1.00	DARE
BLANCHFORD, E. Britain for the British	.50	ENGE
BROOME, Isaac. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association	.50	KAU
CARPENTER, Edward. Love's Coming-of-Age	1.00	LAF
—England's Ideal	1.00	LIEN
—Civilization, Its Cause and Cure	1.00	
DARROW, Clarence S. Resist not Evil	.75	MACI
DAWSON, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism	1.00	A
—German Socialism and Lassalle	1.00	MAR
ENGELS, Frederick. Condition of the English Working Class in 1844	1.25	if
—The Origin of the Family	.50	MILL
—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	.30	(1
HINDS, Wm. A. American Communities	1.00	NEW
KAUTSKY, Karl. The Social Revolution	.50	W
LAFARGUE, Paul. The Evolution of Property	1.00	PERS
LIEBENECHT, Wilhelm. Memoirs of Karl Marx	.50	A
LONG, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society	1.25	PLAT
MARX, Karl. Capital	2.00	A
—Revolution and Counter-Revolution	1.00	QUIN
MARX and ENGELS. The Communist Manifesto	.50	D
MASSART and VANDERVELDE. Parasitism, Organic and Social	1.00	ROBI
MAYNARD, Miss Tupper. Walt Whitman	1.00	O
NORMAN, James B. The Principles of Social Progress	.50	SIMO
MORRIS and BAX. Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome	1.25	of
PENNINGER, O. E. Letters from New America	.50	SOCI
ROBERTS Evelyn H. The Pure Causeway	1.00	SOCI
ROBERTUS, Karl. Over-Production and Crises	1.00	VAIL
ROGERS, J. E. Thorold. Work and Wages	1.00	VARI
SCHAEFFLE, Dr. The Quintessence of Socialism	1.00	I
SIMONS, A. M. The American Farmer	.50	WAT
SOMBART Werner. Socialism and the Social Movement of the 19th Century	1.00	(1
VANDERVELDE, Emile. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution	.50	WOO
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Vol. I	2.00	H
Volume II.	2.00	

In addition to these books we also publish the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, a magazine of 64 large pages, edited by A. M. Simons and the leading socialists of the world, together with cost \$1.00 a year, 10 cents a copy.

The great work done by our company has only nearly 500 socialists, each of whom has subscribed for more stockholders to enlarge our work. No dividend at cost. Particulars free. Any book in this list mail

CHARLES H. KERR & CO
56 Fifth Avenue



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1903.

NO. 7.

Why Co-operatives Have Failed.



CO-OPERATION is to economics what democracy is to politics. The conquest of the industrial group is the most difficult task democracy ever set about to accomplish. So relentlessly does commercial absolutism repel all the encroachments of the young giant Demos, so singularly does it adapt itself to mastership and subordination that political economists throw up their hands in despair and the masses settle into a sullen belief that the democracy which is true in political life is a lie in industrial life, and that the once irresistible phalanx of the advancing people must shiver itself to pieces against the obdurate battlements of economic necessity.

More than fifty years ago men lent themselves to the hope that the launching of co-operative enterprises would inaugurate a system of industry that would drive from the world both the industrial despot and the industrial slave. Signally has this hope miscarried. It is not enough to point to isolated and exceptional examples, it is not enough to call attention to the fact that after fifty years of failures the effort to establish co-operatives is just as active, just as persistent as ever. The fact that *in so long a period and among so many industrial changes co-operation has not totally displaced the older systems*, has not even produced a tremor among so many upheavals and crashes—has not affected the course of events to the least appreciable extent, proves conclusively that its promoters were too sanguine in their expectations and too prone to underestimate the historic forces with which they had to deal.

I do not wish to be interpreted as claiming that co-operatives may not in some cases succeed in maintaining themselves in the midst of competition, as is instanced at present in England and Belgium, but the point is this: Co-operatives never have and give no evidence that they ever will become a conquering or even an

appreciable force in competition with competitive industry. The relative success of the consumptive co-operatives of Europe is due to the fact that they operate in the final stage of industry where competition is the least felt. Productive co-operatives have invariably failed because they operate in the initial stage of industry against the whole force of competition. The consumptive co-operative is an example of a number of consumers becoming their own market. This power to exclude competition from a given territory is the only power that saves them.

It only remains with us to search out the cause of this failure so that we may be able in the future to steer clear of the Charybdis and Scylla that lie at the right and the left of the course of progress. Singularly enough, the political economist flounders wretchedly on this point. But his failure is easily traceable to a well-known tendency of his to seek justification for the competitive system. The moment he admits the real cause of the failure of the co-operative, he lays bare a vulnerable point in the competitive system; hence we cannot expect light from the political economist. Nor can we expect light from the popular mind because the impossibility of co-operation and the necessity of industrial absolutism have become its habitual mode of thought.

Without digressing further I will go straight to the cause and state it dogmatically, trusting to later elaborations to make it clear: *The reason that the co-operative industrial group succumbs to the capitalistic industrial group is because the capitalistic industrial group is primarily a FIGHTING organization, while the co-operative industrial group is primarily a PRODUCTIVE organization.*

Political economists are forced to acknowledge the fighting character of the capitalistic group. Walker says, "The *armies* of industry can no more be *raised, equipped*, held together, moved and *ENGAGED* without their *commanders* than can the armies of war."

The capitalistic industrial group, from the owner to his least important menial, is the most efficient and relentless fighting organization the world has ever produced. It is the product of a long and precarious struggle for existence, in which its less powerful rivals have been mercilessly weeded out. Its present emergence from the struggle, a struggle in which the slightest mistake perhaps meant ruin, a struggle wherein a mere fluctuation of prices meant perhaps obliteration, is positive proof that it alone possesses those qualifications that insure its existence as long as the conditions to which it has conformed obtain.

What are the qualifications that have preserved the surviving competitive group through all the struggles of the past and give it such power and efficiency now?

First. The absolutism it confers on the head of the organization and the perfect subordination and discipline it maintains over the members. Absolutism and subordination are inseparable from war. When men are at peace with one another they can associate on terms of equality, but when they are engaged in a deadly strife whose stakes are existence, there is no room for sentiment, no place for individuality. The group must acquire directness, mobility, force. All power must be vested in the head. One mind must move the mass. The more powerful that mind and the more obedient the mass, the more efficient will be the organization. Everywhere and at all times this principle has been so clearly recognized that powers of life and death over the subordinates have always been vested in the head. In the army we have the court-martial, in the factory the discharge; one is just as potent in its power to secure discipline, just as destructive to life and liberty in the long run, as is the other. Absolutism reaches its culmination in economics. The absolutism of industry is more absolute than the absolutism of tribal militarism; in the tribe there is usually a council of justice, in the factory never. The power that confers ownership on the few is the same power that expropriates the many, brings them to the service of the few, robs them of all divergent interests and knits them into solid organizations that have the directness and force of missiles. Ownership gives the master power to augment his force on a rising market, diminish it on a falling market, disband it during a panic and re-enlist it after; it permits him to utilize it in every way convenient to himself, to meet all fluctuations of prices, to offset the counterstrokes of rivals and to engage in all that large class of "business" activities that essentially constitute *war* and not *production*. The selection of the captains of industry is the same process that selects the strong animals of the forest for survival. It is the strong man in business who wins out—the persistent, aggressive, shrewd, cold, calculating, remorseless fighting man. He is a distinct type and a successor of the tribal warrior. Democratic election would never place him in charge of industry, it would never develop him. The fighting man can only be developed and enthroned in power by ages of interminable war. As long as war is the mode of business, this type will hold the fort.

Second. Another important qualification of the capitalistic group as a fighting organization is *its power to accumulate capital*. Capital is the great conquering agency only by which the market of each group can be extended, and the great expropriating agency by which it alone can absorb the properties of its rivals. The capital of the owner of an industrial group is at once his weapon, his territory and his booty. *Capital is produced by transforming all surplus wealth into capital*. Right here where

the capitalistic group transforms as much as it can of the constructive elements of life into capital to be used as a destructive agency against all rival life, it proclaims its essentially warlike character. This organization has been perfectly adapted, by a long process of development, to accumulate a maximum amount of capital. This it does by imposing abstinence upon all its subordinates. There is but one individual, or at most but a small number, who have any consumptive capacity worth taking into account. The great mass of workers, who outnumber the owners as an hundred or thousand to one, require only the oil that lubricates and the fuel that fires the great senseless human machine which clanks interminably and relentlessly in obedience to the Gorgon of Capital. As the capitalistic group is the most efficient machine thinkable for the production of capital on account of the economy of abstinence enforced by its owner, likewise *it exists solely for the production of capital. The moment it ceases to produce capital for its owner it ceases to exist.* Let once this group start on its mad career, there can be no pause, no halting. The one condition of existence is a constant battle for the market, a constant increment of capital. Let once it weaken the capital to enrich its members or let it relax the discipline, and its doom is sealed and more remorseless rivals take its place. The stern realities of war are as true here as anywhere.

Such is the capitalistic group as a fighting organization; as an agent of production it cannot rank high. Production with it is an incidental phenomenon. While it cannot be denied that it has wonderful efficiency in developing the forces of production, it is utterly impotent to utilize them. Its absolutism, so necessary in war, works incalculable harm in the peaceful arts of production. It robs the members of individuality, individual initiative, freedom of action, and the keen joy of the master workman and the creator. It robs the workman of the advantage of intelligence and culture and reduces his efficiency far below the normal level. The ownership by the master of the enterprise and the product, so necessary to economic absolutism, alienates the worker from all interest in his work; he becomes merely a time-server and an eye-pleaser, buffeted daily between the lash of hunger and the anguish of distasteful work. The organization itself, being designed primarily to capture and hold the market, is recruited, officered and co-ordinated on a footing of war, and can never utilize more than a certain percentage of its forces for production. I leave the really vital reason of its inefficiency as a productive organization until the last. This reason is *that in order to produce capital it reduces the consumptive capacities of its members to the minimum.* The other causes of its inefficiency in production are important and entail incalculable waste, but this is the essential point—it is

the rock upon which the system breaks. Consumption is the origin and fountain of production; whatever limits consumption limits to the same extent production. *A minimum consumption unavoidably means a minimum production.* The productive system that limits consumption is a system that undermines and destroys its own efficiency.

To summarize: The competitive group fails as an efficient productive force,

First, because it reduces the efficiency of the individual producer to the minimum.

Second, because it can utilize only the minimum proportion of its force in production and must employ the major portion in competition.

Third, because it reduces consumption, and consequently production, to the minimum.

We observe that the very characteristics that make it such an irresistible fighting organization render it incompetent as a productive agency.

Now let us turn to the co-operative industrial group. The co-operative group is just as weak as a fighting organization as is the capitalistic group as a productive organization, and is just as strong as a productive force as is the capitalistic group as a fighting force. We have already noted that the essential qualities of a successful competing industrial group are:

First, the absolutism that gives complete power and discipline over the whole organization.

Second, its power to accumulate a maximum amount of capital by reducing the consumptive capacities of its members to the minimum.

The co-operative group possesses neither of these qualifications. It is an association of equals. They will not voluntarily confer powers of life and death on their head. They will not subject themselves to a subordination that robs them of dignity and manhood. They will not submit themselves to a discipline that is painful and humiliating and takes away their individuality. Their organization lacks directness and force because the management owes its position to the constituent members; it is hampered by the scruples and the divergent opinions of the latter, and has not the great personal risk that stimulates the captain of industry. The organization is immobile and moves slowly because it is composed of a mass of distinct individualities possessing equal power. It cannot augment its force, reduce its force, or disband its force, to meet the exigencies of the market, and it cannot move upon the enemy with the quickness and audacity of its rivals. On an average its management is not liable to be as strong in fighting qualities as the owner of the capitalistic group

because men's judgments are not so unerring as the natural selection of evolutionary law. But its weakness does not lie so much in these conditions as *in its incapacity to accumulate capital*. This alone, were it as strong as its rivals in all other regards, would render it incompetent to meet them in open battle. *The co-operative does not exist for the production of capital; it exists primarily for the production of consumable wealth*. Here at least are a group of men who refuse to surrender their bodies and souls to the devouring Frankenstein of Capital. Here is an association of individuals who have combined and refused to pay tribute to the masters, in order that each may obtain a maximum amount of consumable wealth. Each has a personal and equal claim on the wealth product that tells heavily on the capital. To surrender this claim in order to strengthen the fund of capital in the face of aggressive foes is to forego the very purpose for which the co-operative exists and to annul all the advantages it promises in comparison with the capitalistic group; to enforce these claims is to reduce the fund of capital to the minimum in the face of unrelenting foes who have methods for extracting the maximum amount of capital. Those groups that consent to enter into the strife of commercial life must accept the painful conditions of war if they would survive. They must accept the absolutism, the crushing out of sentiment and individuality, and the denial of all that raises man above the mere drudge, and subject themselves to the most cruel and onerous conditions. As well attempt to abolish war among the Dervishes of Soudan by planting in their midst a colony of non-resisting Quakers as to try to abolish competition by establishing co-operatives.

Now we come to the qualifications of the co-operative group as a productive agency. In order to understand the vast productive capacity of co-operative production we will have to conceive of the co-operative group operating in a co-operative society. The isolated co-operative, working within present society, is so handicapped by the conditions competition imposes that it is little better than the capitalistic group as a productive factor.

Co-operation is the normal mode of production:

First, because it raises the efficiency of the individual producer to the maximum.

Second, because it utilizes the maximum proportion of its forces for purely productive purposes.

Third, because it raises consumption, and consequently production, to the maximum.

Of course when I here use the term co-operation I do not use it in the sense of the vast body of co-operative labor that moves the Herculean machinery of to-day for the capitalist, but I mean democratic ownership and manipulation of enterprises and

products. Co-operation in this sense raises the efficiency of the individual laborer to the maximum because it gives to the laborer a direct interest in the enterprise and the size of the product. The co-operator will perhaps strike the normal medium of interest and effort which lies between the wage-worker on the one hand who has no interest and the individual producer on the other, who has often an abnormal interest. The full and undivided product is the natural reward of effort, the normal stimulus to exertion. It is the natural tie between mind and matter, the vital relation between the creator and the thing created. Associated enterprise is an accomplished and an immutable fact; the only stimulus that will bring from its numerous co-operators the maximum amount of exertion is the certainty of each receiving the full results of his efforts. Apart from this natural stimulus comes an added efficiency that springs from the growth of intelligence and hopefulness among the workers, the deepening of self-respect and character, the expansion of individuality, greater freedom of action, and the growth of the true Art-interest that attaches to all normal labor. The future will see singing workmen like those who built the cathedrals of mediæval times.

The superior economy of co-operative production lies in its necessary utilization of the maximum proportion of social energy in that part of production which consists essentially in the creation of wealth and the minimum proportion in that part of production which consists in the distribution of wealth. We are prepared to understand that this condition is a necessary concomitant of co-operation when we comprehend what co-operation really is. Co-operation is the return of production to its primitive simplicity, wherein the individual is never separated from the tool or the product, but creates and consumes wealth in the simplest and most direct way. Under capitalism the several productive processes are relegated to divergent classes and the individual finds himself separated practically from all the vital processes except one. This differentiation and monopoly of vital functions is the underlying cause of all the misunderstandings, miscegenations, confusions, disorders, neutralization of effort, waste of wealth, and appalling poverty that characterize competition. It necessitates the employment of vast numbers for merely protective and predatory purposes and an extravagant use of officials to keep the rank and file in subjection. Subsidiary institutions such as banking and insurance enterprises, which are the arsenals and magazines of the contending armies, multiply to an enormous extent. In the general anarchy and helplessness parasitic and exotic growths of all kinds drive down their feeders wherever they can secure a foothold and propagate themselves in the general putrescence. Every profession perforce acquires the

nature of a rank and noxious exotic, but distribution itself, the simplest of all the productive processes, develops into a huge parasitic abnormality, even tending to distention, against all the centralizing and constricting forces of the age. Co-operation—the simplification of the productive process—the restoration to the individual of all the vital processes—cuts all these evils from their Cause and they vanish like a passing nightmare. The co-operator simply has but to produce and consume his product. It is inadmissible that he can be separated from his product; to admit that he can be is to deny his essential characteristic. But the co-operator of this age of the division of labor possesses one characteristic difference from the primitive individual producer: The primitive producer produced a *thing*, while the co-operator, being able to produce only a part of a thing, produces a *value*. He perforce receives this value in the credit currency, and the actual product awaits at some convenient place the presentation of his claim. This natural and direct method abolishes at a stroke all those transactions that are termed *commercial* and trims down to their essential basis all those activities that are termed *productive*. Subsidiary and recouping institutions, soliciting and predatory occupations, supernumeraries and hangers-on, parasitic and exotic bodies, must go with that great commercial class that rides on the back of submerged labor. It is difficult to predict to what extent these changes would swell the ranks of the real producers, but it would not be unreasonable to expect a two or threefold increase.

But the really vital characteristic of the co-operative group as a productive factor is that it returns to each individual producer the *maximum product of his labor, reserving for capital only enough to sustain the normal growth and wear of the enterprise*. A fundamental reason why men co-operate is in order to retain for themselves the tribute that would otherwise go to others and secure for themselves the full product of their exertions. Men so conditioned will not acknowledge any claim capital may impose except the normal claim of sustenance and adequate growth. This raises consumption, and consequently production, to the maximum. In order to understand the co-operator as a consumer we have only to conceive of him as a producer for himself, as one who is supplying all his own needs, which in reality the co-operator does. If machinery and productive methods are inadequate, his wants are a market that cannot be supplied, consequently a glut is impossible; if productive methods are ample for all his wants, demand and supply are constant quantities and balance each other to a nicety; if they produce more than he can consume, he employs them only as he needs them, and leisure and all its concomitants fill up the lucid inter-

vals of life; in any case, overproduction cannot mean what it implies now—congestion, suspension, stagnation, starvation—it can only mean the leisure to enjoy accumulations—that ultimate desideratum for which we all struggle so desperately now.

It is often urged in justification of industrial absolutism that the arbitrary powers and disproportionate rewards of the employing class are necessary in order to secure management capable of organizing and attending to the large, intricate, and varied interests that go under the name of business. It is strange that men who pose as political economists should see any necessary intricacy or difficulty in the simple act of making an article and turning it over to its producer; it is stranger still that they cannot see that all this intricacy and all the varied duties that call for such unusual talent are phenomena that belong to competition and not to production; that the ability that they consider so necessary to success and which is purchased at such fearful sacrifices of the race is not ability to produce economically and enormously, but ability to crush active and persistent rivals—ability to fight; that this uncommon ability is destructive rather than constructive, and would have no currency in a constructive society. They place themselves in the absurd position of justifying commercial absolutism because it alone can develop the ability necessary to combat the forces it arrays against itself on account of its false ethical and economic basis.

The management of the co-operative within a co-operative society is a very different affair. The co-operative management will not be a fighting body because it will have no one to fight. It will have no market to study; the markets will rise and fall with the efforts of each co-operator; they will be comprehended in the act of production. It will have no rivals to watch, no fluctuations to guard against, no stringencies to prepare for, no advertising, no overbidding or underselling, no tricks of trade to learn, no resorts to adulterations, no deceptions to propagate, no money kings to depend upon and no stock exchange to fear; only one thing to do—PRODUCE—to produce economically and enormously; to so understand the law of average consumption, productive co-ordination and the resources of society and nature, that the forces of production can be employed most economically. Who is the man best fitted to perform this task? Unquestionably the Scientist. The day the management of business falls from the commercial warrior to the scientist industrialist will be a propitious day for the human family. Each is the logic of the system for which he stands. Only the law of natural selection operating in a warring society could have developed the characteristics we observe in the capitalist, and only such a law could have placed him in power. Only the elements of culture and civilization de-

velop the qualities which we observe in the scientist, and only democratic election can place him where he will be of most service to industry.

Such is the co-operative; so weak in all that constitutes fitness for war; so strong in all the elements that constitute fitness for peace. Before we can hope to reap the bountiful harvest promised by modern production, before we can realize the coming age of Art and Spiritual Gladness we must hush forever the strident voice of commercial war. As well try to democratize the army in the midst of war as attempt to democratize the industrial group in the midst of competition. Absolutism is inseparable from the struggle for existence. *The only path open for the advancing hosts of Democracy is the path that leads to the conquest of the Monopolistic public powers, against whose bulwarks the punitive forces of competition are powerless.* The position of the International Socialist Party is the only position that is tenable for those who would bring about industrial democracy.

Murray E. King.

Bishop Spalding and Socialism.*

OWING to the prominence which Bishop Spalding has attained in the recent coal strike and in other matters relating to labor, his recent book on Socialism and Labor is worthy of more attention than it might otherwise merit. But the book itself is well worthy of examination. The introductory paragraphs are, on the whole, a very fair statement of the Socialist argument, and we therefore quote them at length:

"The interest which all who think take in the laboring classes, whether it spring from sympathy or fear, is a characteristic feature of the age.

"Their condition seems to be the great anomaly in our otherwise progressive and brilliant civilization. Whether when compared with the lot of the slaves and serfs of former times that of the laborer is fortunate, is not the question. He is not placed in the midst of the poverty and wretchedness of a rude and barbarous society, but in the midst of boundless wealth and great refinement. He lives, too, in a democratic age, in which all men profess to believe in equality and liberty; in an age in which the brotherhood of the race is proclaimed by all the organs of opinion. He has a voice in public affairs, and since laborers are in the majority, he is, in theory, at least, the sovereign. They who govern profess to do everything by the authority of the people, in their name and for their welfare; and yet, if we are to accept the opinions of the Socialists, the wage-takers, who in the modern world are the vast multitude, are practically shut out from participation in our intellectual and material inheritance. They contend that the poor are, under the present economic system, the victims of the rich, just as in the ancient societies the weak were the victims of the strong; so that wage-labor, as actually constituted, differs in form rather than in its essential results from the labor of slaves and serfs. And even dispassionate observers think that the tendency of the present system is to intensify rather than to diminish the evils which do exist; and that we are moving towards a state of things in which the few will own everything, and the many be hardly more than their hired servants. In America they admit that sparse population and vast natural resources that as yet have hardly been touched helped to conceal this fatal tendency, which is best seen in the manufacturing and commercial centers of Europe, where the capitalistic method of production has reduced wage-earners to a condition of pauperism and

* Socialism and Labor and Other Arguments. Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria. A. C. McClurg & Co. Cloth, 225 pp. 80 cents net.

degradation which is the scandal of Christendom and a menace to society.

"The present condition of labor is the result of gradually evolved processes, running through centuries.

"The failure of the attempt of Charlemagne to organize the barbarous hordes which had overspread Europe into a stable empire was followed by an era of violence and lawlessness, of wars and invasions, from which society sought refuge in the feudal system. The strong man, as temporal or spiritual lord, was at the top of the feudal hierarchy, and under him the weak formed themselves into classes. The serf labored a certain number of days for himself, and a certain number for his lord. In the towns the craftsmen were organized into guilds which protected the interests of the members. The mendicant poor were not numerous, and their wants were provided for by the bishops and the religious orders.

"Then the growth of towns and the development of trade and commerce brought wealth to the burghers, who became a distinct class, while domestic feuds and foreign wars, especially the Crusades, weakened and impoverished the knights and barons. The printing press and the use of gunpowder in war helped further to undermine the feudal power, while the discovery of America, the turning of the Cape of Good Hope, and the Protestant revolution threw all Europe into a ferment from which new social conditions were evolved. The peasants who had been driven from the land by the decay of the great baronial houses, and the confiscation of the property of the church, flocked into the towns or became vagabonds. The poor became so numerous that permanent provision had to be made for them, and poor laws were consequently devised.

"The master-workman, who in the middle ages employed but two or three apprentices and as many journeymen, gave way to a class of capitalists, enriched by the confiscated wealth of the church, by the treasures imported from America and the Indies, and by the profits of the slave traffic, who at once prepared to take advantage of the stimulus to industry given by the opening of a vast world market. As late as the middle of the last century, however, manufacturing was still carried on by masters who employed but a small number of hands, and had but little capital invested in the business; and the modern industrial era, with its factory system, properly begins with our marvelous mechanical inventions and the use of steam as a motive power. Machinery made production on a large scale possible, and threw the whole business into the hands of the capitalists, while laborers are left with nothing but their ability to work, which they are forced to sell at whatever prices it will bring. The capitalist's one aim is to

amass wealth, and he buys human labor just as he buys machinery or raw material, at the lowest rate at which it can be obtained. It is either denied that the question of wages has an ethical aspect, or it is maintained that the competition among capitalists themselves, which under the present system of production is inevitable, compels employers to ignore considerations of equity. Hence it comes to be held that whatever increases profits is right. The hours of labor are prolonged, the sexes are intermingled, children are put to work in factories, sanitary laws are violated; wares are made in excess of demand; and in consequence of the resulting glut of the markets, wages are still further lowered or work is stopped; and the laborers, whether they continue to work or whether they strike, or are forced into idleness, are threatened with physical and moral ruin. The further development of the system is, in the opinion of many observers, towards the concentration of capital in immense joint-stock companies and syndicates, whose directors, by buying competing concerns and also legislatures and judges, make opposition impossible, and render the condition of laborers still more hopeless."

We must also recognize the fact that he has done the Socialist propaganda something of a service in giving the authority of his position as a church dignitary to the statement that Socialism and religion have nothing in common. "A Socialist may be a theist or an atheist, a spiritualist or a materialist, a Christian or an agnostic. . . . A large number of Socialists, it is true, are atheists and materialists, but the earnest desire to discover some means whereby they may be relieved from their poverty and misery, and the resulting vice and crime, is in intimate harmony with the gentle and loving spirit of Him who passed no sorrow by."

Indeed, some of his positions imply an acceptance of economic determinism, as, for example, when he says on page 11: "Events, in fact, solve the great problems, and our discussions are but the foam that crests the waves." Or on page 18, where he points out that "The social order is an organism infinitely complex, the outcome of many forces, whose action and interaction, beginning in the obscure and mysterious, where life and matter first manifest themselves, have been going on for unnumbered ages; and it has so intertwined itself with man's very nature that we may say he is what he is in virtue of the society of which he is the product."

Again, in his recognition of the class character of our present law, he comes very close to Socialism. Speaking of punishment for crime, he says: "The delinquents who are incarcerated are chiefly the poor, who had they money to pay the fines would escape punishment. The heaviest punishment is inflicted on the most helpless, and frequently on the least guilty; and thus the

morally weak, the victims of unfortunate environments, are degraded, hardened, and made habitual offenders."

I do not wish to push the matter too far and to ascribe too great a comprehension of or favorable attitude towards Socialism on the part of Bishop Spalding. But on page 58 we see something that reads very like a description of the rise of proletarian class consciousness. He says: "The laborers, who in proportion as their minds have been awakened, have become conscious of the hardships and limitations to which they are subject, feel this more keenly than any other class, and hence they have formed innumerable organizations to protect their rights and promote their interests."

Finally, we would seldom find a harsher indictment against the capitalist system than is to be found on pages 173 and 174: "The political and social conditions which involve the physical deterioration and the mental and moral degradation of multitudes are barbarous, and unless they are improved must lead to the ruin of the State. From this point of view, which is the only true point of view, our present economic and commercial systems are subversive of civilization. They sacrifice men to money; wisdom and virtue to cheap production and the amassing of capital. They foster greed in the stronger and hate in the weaker. They drive the nations to competitive struggles which are as cruel as war, and in the final results more disastrous; for their tendency is to make the rich vulgar and heartless, and the poor reckless and vicious. As stratagems and lies are considered lawful in war, so in the warfare of commercial competition opinion leans to the view that whatever may be done with impunity is right. The adulteration of food and drink, the watering of stocks, the bribing of legislators, the crushing of weaker concerns, the enforced idleness of thousands, who are thereby driven to despair and starvation, are not looked upon as lying within the domain of morals, any more than the shooting of a man in battle is considered a question of morality. The degradation and ruin of innumerable individuals are implications of the law of competition, just as in the struggle for existence there is a world-crushing and destruction of the weak by the strong."

When we come to the objections we find that many of them have already been answered by the Bishop himself in the statements already quoted and that others arise from misconception. He begins with an attack upon the economics of Karl Marx, and, as seems to be the almost invariable rule of such writers, the first thing of which he falls foul is the labor value theory, in which he imputes to Marx a position which the latter never dreamed of taking. On pages 21 and 22 he says: "The fallacy of the Socialist assumption lies in attributing to labor a value of its own,

independently of the worth of its product. The labor spent in doing useless things has no value; at least no social value. He who makes what nobody wants has his labor for his pains. The question is not what amount of labor an object has cost, but what service can it render?"

But, as has already been pointed out by the *Chicago Socialist*, Marx really anticipated this very objection in *Capital*, and specifically states that he does not mean anything of the kind. In Section I of Chapter I of *Capital*, Marx says: "Lastly, nothing can have value without being an object of utility. If a thing is useless, so is the labor contained in it; the labor does not count as labor, and therefore has no value."

In speaking of this objection it might be well to say that perhaps the most complete explanation of the necessity of utility as an essential of socially valuable labor is to be found in Marx's *Capital*, the only book of which it is most frequently alleged that it denies this position.

We next come across the old familiar objection that you must change human nature. On page 13 we learn that "a prerequisite to all effective and desirable social transformations is a corresponding change in the character of both the masses and their rulers and employers." We could easily set against this the quotation already given, where Bishop Spalding has shown that "events make men."

Although he has already told us that labor created capital, he now finds a new origin for capital by falling back on the long-exposed fallacious theory that capital is also "the result of abstinence from consumption." Marx pointed out years ago that if capital came from the abstinence of any body it was the abstinence of the laborer from the full product of his toil.

On page 165 capital becomes "largely stored ability." We do not know whether Bishop Spalding or the Rev. Hillis first evolved this remarkable definition. But again we can leave it to Marx or almost any other Socialist writer to show that Socialists have always included ability, which is but another name for skilled labor, as a part of labor, and it would be difficult for either Bishop Spalding or the Rev. Hillis to attempt to justify the separation of ability from labor.

Next we meet our old friend the enemy in the objection that Socialism would crush out individuality. Here again we simply turn Bishop Spalding against his own words, which we have already quoted, showing how thoroughly capitalism itself crushes out individuality. He tells several times that what is needed is men, not measures. Against this we can place his statements that "events made the men" and let Spalding answer Spalding.

Finally he winds up with the argument, which is as old as

human society and human principles, that economic laws which are immutable make it impossible that wages should rise above a given point or that wealth should be so distributed as to make all men rich. This is simply his *ipse dixit*, against which we can oppose the thousands of volumes now written by the ablest minds of this age, pointing out that the powers of production to-day are so great as to make it easily possible for all physical necessities at least, of all mankind to be easily satisfied.

On the whole, Socialists may well advise the reading of Bishop Spalding's book, especially if a little time is spent in pointing out how often one page answers another and explaining the one or two complete misunderstandings of the Socialist problem. Wheth-
so great as to make it easily possible for at least the physical necessities of all mankind to be easily satisfied.

A. M. Simons.

The American Labor Movement.

I

THERE seems to be considerable misapprehension, especially among Socialists, in regard to the trades-union movement of the"—United States of America, and not only in regard to the trades-union movement of the Western States, as Comrade Eugene V. Debs seems to think, according to the views expressed in his article on "The Western Labor Movement," in the November issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Many years' experience has convinced me that the relationship between trades-unionism and Socialism, i. e., the attitude of the politically organized Socialists towards the Trades Union and general labor movement, is the most vital question in the American Socialist movement. The very existence of the Socialist party depends on the solution of this question, while the Trades-Union movement will be greatly benefited and strengthened and its permanent success assured by the adoption of such fundamental Socialist tactics as will guarantee the healthy co-operation between the economic and political forces of labor in the great struggle of emancipation.

It is significant to know that the Socialist movement develops in about the same manner and ratio as the Trades Unions. Compare the growth in the membership of the American Federation of Labor to the growth of the Socialist vote since 1893. The A. F. of L. had just recovered from the general reaction that followed the eight-hour movement of 1885-86, with its Haymarket and Nov. 11th tragedies. For some time the Federation membership remained almost stationary at the 100,000 mark. To-day its membership is nearly 1,500,000, or, to be very conservative, at least ten times as high as in the early '90's. The same can be said of the Socialist movement. In 1893 the Socialist vote in the United States was less than 26,000. To-day the entire Socialist vote is about 300,000. Which goes to prove that the same economic causes that produce Trades Unionism also produce Socialism. The economic truth that "Labor creates all social value" is recognized and propagated by the Socialists and Trades-Unionists; and the more powerful Capitalism, the more intense the exploitation of the masses of the people, the more hopeless the prospects for better times, the more general the unrest and the desire for economic, political and social changes, hence the more intense intellectual activity among the working class and those directly and immediately dependent on the productive labor of

others. All this tends to extend and strengthen the organization and influence of *Labor*, both economic and political.

It might be claimed that the economic organization of Labor in this country was stronger in 1885-86 than in 1893. This is not correct. With equal right we could assert that the Socialist movement of 1878-80 was stronger than in 1902, because two or more Socialists were elected to the Chicago City Council. The fact of the matter is that the Socialist movement of 1878-80 was a straw-fire of the first Socialist enthusiasm without any backbone, a political protest of Labor against the atrocities committed by Capitalism during the great railroad strike of 1877. In 1885-86 the American proletariat, for the first time in the industrial history of Capitalism, felt the general depression and the rapidly increasing misery and poverty. According to Carroll D. Wright's first annual report, that appeared in 1886, the number of unemployed had increased to over one million.

What was to be done? Reduction of the hours of labor! Eight hours! soon became the general demand of Organized Labor. After less than six months of agitation and organization on the part of a small number of American pioneer Trades-Unionists and German-speaking Socialists this country witnessed one of the most wonderful proletarian uprisings in the history of the International labor movement. From those days on, the Trades-Union movement became an important factor in the industrial and social development of this country.

Here is, in short, the historical recapitulation: The emancipation of the chattel slaves increased the desperate competition on the "free labor market." The new civil war began. While the capitalist tried to buy the commodity, labor, as cheap as possible, the wage-worker, in order to sustain life, had to demand as high a price for his labor-power as possible. These diametrically opposed class interests caused considerable friction, and soon a lively fight was begun. Seeing that the individual wage-worker was a mere straw in the wind when it came to the question of resisting the encroachments of Capitalism, the workmen united into unions—local, national and international unions—and Knights of Labor assemblies. The capitalists lost no opportunity to reduce the wages and lengthen the daily working time of their employes. Wherever human labor power did not realize the desired rate of profit for the employer, new labor-saving machinery was introduced, thousands of men being forced out of work. Women and children were hired to do the machine work, because they worked for considerably less wages. The conditions of the wealth-producing people grew worse from day to day, and this state of affairs caused general alarm. The workmen demanded higher wages and shorter hours of labor. While certain

trades unions had existed many years before the civil war broke out, and while efforts were made by these trades unions to better the condition of their members, it must be borne in mind that the modern labor movement, the struggle between Capitalism and Labor, did not amount to much until 1885 and 1886, when the general eight-hour movement was inaugurated; i. e., the movement for a general reduction of the hours of labor.

The capitalist class had never dreamed of the possibilities of such a movement. Indeed, the movement was a surprise to them, and many granted the demands of their employes out of sheer fear of an impending social revolution. However, the enemies of Labor were not resting on their oars; they soon organized for "self-defense and resistance." The struggle between Organized Labor and Organized Capitalism was on.

The Order of the K. of L. went out of existence; it had fulfilled its historical mission by demonstrating the power and solidarity of Labor. The K. of L. went down, not because Powderly was a demagogue, not because Sovereign was a capitalist politician, not because Professor De Leon tried to use the "remnants" to mend the S. L. P. coat, but because the very form of the K. of L. organization was not adapted to the modern forms of warfare in the proletarian class struggle.

II.

The attitude of the Socialists towards the Trades-Union movement during the last fifteen years furnishes a most interesting subject for the student of the American labor movement. It is a fact that the old German Socialists, most of whom were compelled to leave their country, their homes, their relatives and friends under the Bismarckian Anti-Socialist laws, became the most active pioneers of American Trades-Unionism. Hundreds and thousands of unions were organized by and through them.

When, after the Haymarket tragedy in Chicago, May 4, 1886, the capitalists seemed to have things all their own way, when the dark wave of reaction swept all over the country, threatening to destroy every labor organization, the small pioneer band of German-American Socialists once more appeared in the deserted arena of the class struggle, appealing to the wage-workers to resist the desperate attempts to crush Organized Labor, by organizing an independent political labor movement. This appeal was heeded. In the various parts of the country union labor parties were organized and thousands of votes cast for independent labor candidates. In New York 67,000 votes were polled for Henry George, and the capitalist politicians were frightened like little children overtaken by a severe thunderstorm. "Labor laws" by the bushel were passed by the different State Legislatures and

city councils and everything possible was done to check this independent political labor movement. Labor leaders were provided with political jobs, thereby mortgaging themselves, body and soul, to the old capitalist parties. Democratic and Republican politicians tried to get control over the local central labor unions, and the struggles the Socialists had to get these elements out and force them to the rear are of historical significance and importance.

In 1890 the Socialists of Germany polled about one million votes, thereby putting an end to the political life of the Iron Chancellor, Prince Bismarck, the originator of the anti-Socialist laws. This tremendous Socialist vote surprised the entire civilized world, and, naturally enough, the Socialist movement in this country, being almost exclusively German up to but a few years ago, could not escape the influence of this great Socialist victory in the old country. The Socialist Labor party decided to become an active political party and nominate straight Socialist tickets wherever possible. In 1892 the first Presidential candidate on a strictly Socialist ticket was put in the field and 21,512 votes were cast for the same.

As already mentioned, the Socialist movement of this country was almost exclusively a German-speaking movement, and with the exception of Boston, Chicago and San Francisco there were almost no native American elements active in or for the Socialist party. The conditions for a truly American Socialist movement were not yet ripe, and if a hundred silver-tongued Socialist agitators would have preached the doctrines of Socialism it would not have changed the political situation very much. In 1892 the great strike in Homestead, Pa., broke out; 10,000 State militiamen were called to arms to break this labor insurrection, after the Pinkerton hordes had been almost annihilated during the memorable battle on the banks of the Monongahela river. A decade of the capitalist reign of terror began. In Buffalo, Cripple Creek, Cœur d'Alene, Brooklyn, Tonawanda, Chicago (Pullman), Cleveland, St. Louis and other cities the militia, federal troops, police and deputy sheriffs were pressed into service against the onward march of Organized Labor. Tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of men went on strike for better conditions. While the capitalists were celebrating their World's Fair in Chicago thousands of unemployed were holding meetings on the highways and byways all over the country, and soon hungry, suffering American proletarians were marching from the Pacific coast, "On to Washington!" singing Hamlin Garland's labor hymn:

We have seen the reaper toiling in the heat of summer sun,
We have seen the children needy when the harvesting was done;

We have seen a mighty army, dying helpless one by one,
While their flag went marching on.

Oh, the army of the wretched, how they swarm the city street,
We have seen them in the midnight, where the Goths and Vandals meet;

We had shuddered in the darkness at the noise of their feet—
But their cause goes marching on.

But no longer shall the children bend above the whizzing wheel,
We will free the weary women from their bondage under steel,
In the mines and in the forest, worn and hopeless, men shall feel
His cause is marching on.

Meanwhile the capitalist system of production developed wonderfully into pools and syndicates and trusts, and the concentration of capital went on in ever-increasing rapidity. While the wage-workers were more and more pauperized, the middle class of manufacturers and merchants were driven into bankruptcy and despair.

Under such favorable economic and social conditions it was only natural that both the Trades-Union and the Socialist movement should grow. The eyes of the intelligent working class elements were gradually opened, and no longer could the capitalist politicians scare them by waving the red flag in the bull's face and by wrongfully denouncing the Socialists as the enemies of "our stars and stripes."

The Spanish-American war, with its contemptible feature of "Cuban Emancipation" by the speculators in Wall street, resulted in tearing the mask of patriotic hypocrisy off the face of our American plutocracy. This Cuban Emancipation war, followed by the "benevolently assimilating" war against the Filipinos, 10,000 miles off our shores, disclosed the imperialist secrets and desires of American Capitalism. "Our stars and stripes" were used as a means to fool the people into a patriotism of the insane and to make them fight for American capitalist expansion in Central America and in far-off East Asia. "Overproduction" at home, with thousands of working people starving, induced our industrial lords and commercial pirates to secure foreign markets, by peaceful tricks and speculations, if possible; if not, by force of arms and at the price of hundreds of thousands of human lives and the freedom of foreign nations that had been almost unknown to us five years ago.

During the last three or four years the American Trades-Union and the Socialist movements have doubled and trebled their membership, which may be mainly attributed to the above-pictured economic, political and social conditions.

In view of the fact that the German-American Socialists were ever anxious to get English-speaking elements interested in their movement, it can readily be understood how men with no exceptional or extraordinary intellectual powers or ability could play the leading roles in the Socialist movement. "We must have the Americans!" "We must reach the English-speaking elements!" were the often-repeated expressions of our old German comrades. I remember the great rejoicing of our old pioneer friends when in 1889 they succeeded in securing the services of the renowned adventurer, Professor Garside, of Baltimore. Professor Dan De Leon entered the Socialist movement (as an inheritance of the Henry George campaign) as a man of less than average intelligence; but our German comrades were anxious "to reach the English-speaking people," and so Professor De Leon was enveiled with a cloud of supernatural gift and power, was nursed and flattered until he himself got the idea of being the personification of Socialist wisdom and the incarnation of political omnipotence.

The attitude of the Socialist Labor party towards the Trades-Union movement from 1890 on to the present day has been a most unfortunate one, and we should profit by their expensive experience. While theoretically the Socialist party adopted an entirely new policy, in reality the everyday practice of many of our party members differs but little from the S. L. P. methods. Unfortunately there are still many Socialists who look upon the Trades Unions as a movement without any historical missionary and emancipating merits of its own, but which should be made the tail end of some Socialist political movement.

III.

In 1891 the American Federation of Labor met in Detroit, Mich. Our New York comrades made a serious break that caused them much trouble and finally threatened the very existence of their Socialist movement for the time. Section New York Socialist party was represented by delegates in the New York Central Labor Federation. This Federation elected Lucian Sanial as delegate to the Detroit convention of the A. F. of L. This caused a fight on the floor of the convention, and Thomas J. Morgan, delegate of the Chicago Trades Assembly, although not quite in accord with the New York move, fought a splendid battle in favor of Sanial's admission as a delegate. The A. F. of L., however, decided not to admit Sanial because he did not represent any Trades Union, but was a direct representative of a political party.

Here the trouble began. A campaign of revenge was opened against the A. F. of L., although Section New York, admitting their mistake of being directly represented in a central trades

union body, withdrew its delegates from the Central Labor Federation soon after. Messrs. De Leon, Vogt, Sanial and others continued their nefarious propaganda, and when in 1895 the A. F. of L. convened in New York, the above-mentioned "leaders of Socialism" had their plans and schemes cut and dried; they launched a Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance on the troubled waters of the American labor movement, and the birth of this "*enfant terrible*" was celebrated in grand style and with at least a dozen times more "enthusiasm and inspiration and hopes for the dawn of proletarian emancipation" than the late Denver convention of the Western Labor or American Labor Union.

The Socialist Labor party was almost a unit in indorsing the new union movement. In 1896 De Leon, Sanial and Vogt succeeded in hypnotizing and deceiving the Socialist Labor Party convention held in the City of New York and the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was officially indorsed. De Leon, Sanial and Vogt pledged their word of honor that their new union movement was not directed against the A. F. of L. or against any of the existing labor organizations. For hours they tried to prove by statistical figures how they would get the unorganized into line, and that they had not the least intention of organizing rival unions. Poor creatures!

From that hour on the open hostilities and attacks on the American Federation of Labor began, and with this warfare of revenge and destruction on the economic field also commenced the demoralization and the suicidal work of the Socialist Labor party itself. The S. T. and L. A. got unavoidably mixed up in fights against a number of national unions, the S. L. P. could not escape the consequences, section after section of the party was suspended for violating the "Estiela" principles and tactics. Suspension and expulsion right and left, until Sanial expelled Vogt, and De Leon expelled Sanial, and Kuhn will expel De Leon, and the dog's tail will swallow the dog itself.

These are historical facts.

In 1898 the Social Democratic party was organized in Chicago after the secession from the Colonists. The S. D. P., not without considerable opposition, adopted a new policy concerning the attitude of the Socialists towards the Trades-Union movement. This attitude was re-indorsed by the Indianapolis convention a year later, and in July, 1901, the Unity convention unanimously adopted the following declaration, determining the attitude of the Socialist party of America towards the Trades Unions:

"The Trade-Union movement and independent political action are the chief emancipating factors of the wage-working class. The Trade-Union movement is the natural result of capitalist production, and represents the economic side of the working-class

movement. We consider it the duty of Socialists to join the unions of their respective trades and assist in building up and unifying the trades and labor organizations. We recognize that trades unions are by historical necessity organized on neutral grounds, as far as political affiliation is concerned.

"We call the attention of trades-unionists to the fact that the class struggle so nobly waged by the trades-union forces to-day, while it may result in lessening the exploitation of labor, can never abolish that exploitation. The exploitation of labor will only come to an end when society takes possession of all the means of production for the benefit of all the people. It is the duty of every trades-unionist to realize the necessity of independent political action on Socialist lines, to join the Socialist party and assist in building up a strong political movement of the wage-working class, whose ultimate aim and object must be the abolition of wage-slavery, and the establishment of a co-operative state of society, based on the collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution."

This resolution is characteristic of our Socialist Party movement, and sharply and strikingly draws the line between the truly class conscious Socialist movement and the misconceived, misunderstood, misinterpreted so-called class movement of De Leonism.

IV.

In his article on "The Western Labor Movement" in the November INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Comrade Eugene V. Debs speaks of "the lukewarm comment and the half-approving, half-condemning tone of the Socialist party press and the uncalled for, unwise and wholly unaccountable official pronunciamento of the St. Louis "Quorum" in reference to the action of the Western Labor Union in favor of Socialism at its Denver convention. Furthermore, Comrade Debs says:

"Stripped of unnecessary verbiage and free from subterfuge, the Socialist party has been placed in the attitude of turning its back upon the young, virile, class-conscious union movement of the West, and fawning at the feet of the 'pure and simple' movement of the East, and this anomalous thing has been done by men who are supposed to stand sponsor to the party and whose utterance is credited with being *ex cathedra* upon party affairs.

"They may congratulate themselves that upon this point at least they are in perfect accord with the capitalist press, and also with the 'labor lieutenants,' the henchmen and heelers, whose duty it is to warn the union against Socialism and guard its members against working-class political action."

Having been the originator and most ardent supporter of the

above-mentioned "Quorum" resolution, I feel justified in more clearly stating my position in the matter. Some Socialist papers have printed the "Quorum" resolution in full and commented on it. Others published the resolution without comment. Again, others commented or denounced the "Quorum" without publishing a line of the resolution. One comrade editor complimented the "Quorum" members as "Happy Hooligans"—but none of the Socialist papers, with but one or two exceptions, saw fit to discuss the action of the "Quorum" intelligently, as it would have been their duty to do.

This showed a weak point in our party, a lack of clearness in the conception of the aims and objects of our movement.

The Western Labor Union convention indorsed Socialism and the Socialist party?

Every Socialist applauded this action. So did the St. Louis "Quorum."

The Western Labor Union changed its name into American Labor Union and decided to extend its field of operation to the Eastern States.

My experience prevented me from applauding this second action of the convention. I do not care what the promises or arguments of the delegates were that took the above action. Whether the comrades and brothers were actuated by a spirit of resentment towards the A. F. of L., or by the desire to build up a Socialist trades-union movement is not the question that concerns me in this case. Neither can we consider what our wishes would be. We are confronted by conditions and facts, not by theories and wishes.

What are the facts?

Comrade Debs knows the Western elements, he knows their courage, their honesty, their energy, their progressive spirit. All well and good. I have no reason to disbelieve him. But what does this prove? Does it prove that the Westerners are more honest, more sincere than the Eastern wage slaves? That they are more honest and sincere than those hundreds and thousands of Socialists who assisted in the organization of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance?

But the conditions and facts?

The American Labor Union, if it wants to carry out its program as originally planned, will have to send its organizers East, to St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, New York, Boston. Having indorsed the Socialist party, the Socialist party is expected to indorse the A. L. U. and do what?

Organize A. L. U. local unions.

Where?

In St. Louis, Chicago, Terre Haute, Milwaukee, New York, Boston, Haverhill, Brockton and elsewhere, perhaps in the mining regions of Pennsylvania.

Next?

Nearly every trade is organized in the cities and regions named. Organized under the A. F. of L. Well, we organize rival A. L. U. local unions.

What next? Will these new unions go 'way back and sit down?

No; they are anxious to expand, to grow. They will try to get new members. Where from? From the old A. F. of L. unions.

Then they will make demands on the bosses. The demands are refused. The strike begins.

What next?

The A. L. U. convention has indorsed Socialism; its members are supposed to be Socialist trades-unionists. Strikers will get empty pockets, will get hungry, their families will suffer.

Will a Socialist stomach stand more hunger and contraction than the conservative miner's stomach in Pennsylvania? Will the Socialist striker's family stand the suffering and privations more patiently than the family of the conservative?

Answer, please!

There is a limit to the sphere of Trades-Unionism. Keep this in your mind.

Well, our A. L. U. will strike at the ballot box, I hear some say.

What have we got the Socialist Party for?

The fact is this: The A. L. U. cannot expand east of the Mississippi without getting into a most disastrous fight against the A. F. of L.

Our Socialist Party movement cannot afford, has no right, to be dragged into a fight between two national Federations of Trades Unions.

The St. Louis "Quorum" took action on the A. L. U. matter after it was called upon to issue an organizers' commission of the Socialist Party to a general officer and organizer of the American Labor Union, and after considerable confusion had been created amongst our comrades in various parts of the country, which goes to show that an attempt was made to drag the Socialist Party right into this trades-union controversy and rivalry.

I do not speak for the "Quorum;" I express my personal opinion and accept the responsibility of what I write or speak on this question.

Would Comrade Debs go to work and organize the Terre Haute trades into A. L. U. local unions? Certainly not. I don't recog-

nize any "pure and simple" and "Socialist" Trades-Unions, because I consider it ridiculous to make people believe that a mere pledge to a Socialist platform will make a man a Socialist or transform a conservative union over night into a Socialist union.

Comrade Debs knows from experience that leaders, no matter how honest, good and Socialistic they may be, cannot create a labor movement where conditions are not favorable. Sam Gompers is not the A. F. of L., and I must protest against the assertion that the A. F. of L. unions have not assisted their Western brothers when in trouble. I remember one instance when the St. Louis Central Trades and Labor Union donated the entire Labor Day picnic income, amounting to about \$700, to the striking members of the Western Miners' Union.

The Western brothers got sore at Sam Gompers and some other individuals and left the A. F. of L. They had a perfect right to do so. But if other radical elements had done likewise, would there be such a splendid Socialist progress among the rank and file of the A. F. of L. as can be witnessed in every industrial center of the East?

Educate the rank and file, let them elect Socialist delegates, representing the carpenters, miners, cigarmakers, machinists, printers, etc., and you will soon get rid of leaders whom you consider detrimental to the progress of the movement.

Often, very often, have I been disappointed and discouraged in the Trades-Union movement, but this is no reason why I should not continue the good work of Socialist propaganda in the movement.

I can fully understand the action of the American Labor Union, I may excuse it to a certain extent, but I cannot indorse it, still less can I encourage the work in that direction.

Here, again, I fully agree with Comrade Debs when he says:

"The party, as such, must continue to occupy this friendly, yet non-interfering position, but the members may, of course, and in my judgment should, join the trades-unions East and West and North and South, and put forth their best efforts to bring the American labor movement to its rightful position in the struggle for emancipation."

May the time soon come when these factional fights will cease and the work of the grand army of Organized Labor will be crowned with victory and success.

Comrades of the A. L. U., we may disagree as to tactics, but I am with you heart and soul in the glorious war for the economic freedom of Labor.

Yours for Labor and Socialism,

G. A. Hoehn.

Who Said "Scab?"

NO man forgets the time he first heard a crowd of strikers yell "scab!" If his affiliations were with capitalism and the masters he remembers "how wicked the mob looked," and with what a sense of pleasure and increasing security he saw the line of bluecoats beat back the men and boys who crowded round the scabs. But if, on the other hand, he was himself a wage-worker, the strikers had his sympathy at once, and even if not a union man he felt a longing to help in the struggle—the class struggle. Not that he "scientifically" understood that there was a class struggle—no more did the strikers, nor the police—but self-preservation is a most wonderful force in nature and the wage-worker feels drawn to stand by his class as instinctively as animals herd together for protection against devouring enemies or wintry storms.

Yes, society is an organism—in spite of the protestations of little individualists—and the man who attempts to thwart the movements of the masses is soon dispatched and thrown out of the hive like the stupid drone who opposes the workers.

Even outside of the ranks of Socialism sharp thinkers have discovered the existence of social-organic action, and practical rules have been formulated, by business men, from which it can be foretold when people are going to die—not individually, mind you, no! no! but in the mass—as witness the tables drawn up by life insurance companies whereby the length of life of a given number of people can be calculated to a nicety.

A scab then is a man who is fighting against fate. Through some malformation in his nervous system nature has been unable to warn him that he must herd with his class or the wolves will devour him.

It was this lack of mental understanding which brought about the death of the Socialist Labor party,—as it will surely bring about the extinction of any Socialist party that scabs against organized labor.

Where De Leon and the Socialist Labor party failed most miserably, no other party need think to succeed. Scabbing at the ballot box will be as fatal to those who oppose organized labor as scabbing on the "economic field" was to the Socialist Labor party.

See what happened in California in the history of the Socialist movement: A few years ago one of our candidates in San Francisco polled over four thousand votes, while at the last municipal

election, when the Union Labor party also had a ticket in the field, we polled a little under one thousand votes, and now, at the last state election, the only Socialist candidate that ran in opposition to the Union Labor party, in the district of San Francisco, receives but 616 votes. And remember, the most ardent Socialist propaganda has been kept up in San Francisco for more than twenty years. If blame then is to be attached to any for this "backsliding," on whose shoulders must it rest? Not upon the shoulders of individuals, surely, for the Golden Gate has had the use of the best blood and brains that the American revolutionary movement ever possessed. If then we cannot blame individuals, the fault must lie either with the working class or the Socialist party,—who, for some strange reason, have not "fused." But dare we condemn the instinct of the working class?—for what other class, what other individuals, what other party, but the workers themselves are better fitted to understand the needs of the working class and bring about their salvation? And, if thus we find the workers of San Francisco condemning the action of the Socialist party in that city—as has been shown by the record of votes—the conclusion must be drawn that the tactics of our party have been wrong,—for no excuse can pardon any form of opposition to the working class when it lines up to fight the capitalist class.

The Socialist party is a revolutionary body first and a political party afterwards. To-day it is unquestionably expedient to fight our battle for power at the ballot-box. But suppose that events should so form themselves that the working class would be deprived of the right to acquire power through the ballot-box? Would we not organize the battle upon other lines? And if such necessity arose who can say just what form the class struggle would then take?

The tradesunions are sometimes a better representative of a mobile revolutionary force than the Socialist party. See how they act, and learn how the logic of Socialism is born from the experience of the wage-working class:

Step by step the workers suffer, organize and struggle with the wage-masters for bread.

From start to finish it is a battle in which blow is answered by blow.

First the master reduces wages.

And the worker strikes.

Then the master blacklists.

And the worker boycotts.

Finally the master uses the injunction-judges and the troops.

And the worker turns to the ballot-box.

All this is a chain of events, each link of which must be supported by revolutionary Socialists, whose duty is to unite the

workers of the world against the private owners of the commonwealth.

It will be seen that thus far, in this presentation of arguments, no reference has been made to some remarkable declarations that have lately come from organized labor, in its initial attempts to enter politics.

In Los Angeles, California, the Union Labor party issued the following preamble, in conjunction with its municipal platform:

"We, the organized wage-workers of Los Angeles, in convention assembled, declare in favor of the principles of the American Federation of Labor and the international working-class movement.

"The struggle which is going on in all the civilized world between the oppressors and the oppressed in all countries—a struggle between the capitalist and the laborer—must result in the abolition of the wage system, for wages can never be regarded as the full equivalent for labor performed.

"We believe that the various changes in national, State and municipal laws which are needed to give the producer the full equivalent of his toil can best be secured by united action at the ballot-box.

"We pledge our candidates, if elected, to carry out the before-mentioned principles to the full extent of their power."

In El Paso, Texas, a Union Labor party prints the following preamble to its municipal platform:

"In view of the fact that the logic of events has proven conclusively the impossibility of the working class being able to secure such municipal legislation as has become necessary from the corrupt parties of capitalism, i. e., Democratic and Republican—we, therefore, call upon all members of the working class, and all good citizens generally, to affiliate with the Union Labor party, to the end that we may secure to ourselves the following legislation."

On the other hand, no doubt, it can be shown that the platforms of certain Union Labor parties are far from clear,—notably the one in San Francisco. But we ask in all fairness, when our comrades in this last mentioned place are so befogged in their understanding of the class struggle as to declare war on organized labor when it is in actual bloody battle with organized capital (for it must be remembered that just before the election of Mayor Schmitz in San Francisco the police were clubbing and shooting members of the Union Labor party who were engaged in the last great strike), can we be surprised at the lack of Socialist phraseology in that particular platform?

But isolated action in any particular city, be it impregnated with a large or small degree-of scientific declaration of the needs of the working class, has no bearing upon the argument we have attempted to express. It is an abstraction that we desire to present for an answer, and may be summed up as follows:

1. Is there a class struggle between the wage-earners and the wage-master?

2. Does this class struggle divide society into two parts?

If these things be true, then, when the wage-earners fight their masters on the political field, on the economic field, or any other field—and by thus doing divide society into two antagonistic parts—on which side must the "revolutionary, class-conscious, Socialist" be found? He cannot be neutral, he cannot get off the earth, and so he must be found fighting either with the wage-workers, or, like the S. L. P., be caught scabbing with the capitalists.

John Murray, Jr.

Los Angeles, California, Dec. 10, 1902.

the California Situation.

THE Socialist party has long prided itself on "never making a compromise to placate an enemy or gain a friend." All Socialists were confident that whatever other parties might do, the Socialist party would never indulge in fusion. Even outsiders had come to believe that a compromising deal with the Socialist party was impossible. Was it strange, then, that consternation should run through the Socialist movement of the whole country, when it was learned that the Socialist party in the two largest cities of California had withdrawn from the local field in the interest of a so-called Union Labor party, a party of reactionary principles, that in two of the three counties where it had tickets was in close alliance with the capitalistic Democratic party?

The main purpose of this article is to correct any false impression that people outside of California may have concerning the attitude of the Socialist party in this State toward compromising action; and by a comparison of election returns to prove that the action of the Socialists of San Francisco and Los Angeles was not necessary nor justified as a means of winning votes for the Socialist State ticket.

The advent of the Union Labor party in California, with strength enough to elect the mayor of the largest city in the State; the apparent strong tendency of the trades-unionists to renounce all relations with both old parties; the appearance of speakers on the Union Labor party rostrum talking strongly in favor of Socialism, made the situation a puzzling one, and for a time left many good Socialists undecided as to the wisest course of action.

The matter came up for discussion in the State convention while the new State constitution was under consideration. An amendment was offered making the nomination of a Socialist ticket mandatory at all places where candidates could be had. A substitute for this amendment was introduced, allowing the Socialist party to refrain from nominating whenever "a bona fide" labor party, demanding the abolition of the wage system, and with working class nominees appeared in the field. The battle over the "amendment" and the "substitute" therefor, was waged in the State convention for eleven hours, and no one could tell with whom were the fortunes of war. The matter was finally compromised by referring it to a vote of the locals of the State.

The writer is probably as well acquainted as any man with the personnel of the Socialist party in California. And he knows that

some of the straightest and best Socialists in the State for a time favored the "substitute," who after sober second thought became radical supporters of the "amendment." Nor should we impeach the motives of those who stood for the "substitute" to the last. Doubtless the Socialist party of California, like all other parties, has its professional opportunists, always ready to bargain for the furtherance of immediate ends; but unquestionably the great majority of those who voted for the "substitute" did, what seemed to them to be for the party's ultimate good.

Now, when I announce that the "substitute" won by seven majority in the State vote, many people at a distance will declare that the Socialist party in California has gone to the "demnition bowwows," and become an unreliable, half-baked opportunist movement. Such a conclusion would be far from the truth. Already there is a strong reaction all along the line. Put the "amendment" and the "substitute" to a vote to-morrow, and the latter would be overwhelmingly defeated without a doubt. It would be defeated in San Francisco by a goodly vote. People who still justify the San Francisco action as an experiment declare it will never be repeated.

Unfortunately the argument for the "amendment" had but a limited hearing before the party's rank and file. The Socialist papers of the State, in existence prior to the vote, favored the "substitute." They presented plausible arguments in its defense and to many party papers have the authority of oracles. The party papers outside the State, not knowing the situation, did not discuss the question at all. Hence the battle must be fought over again. Next time the "amendment" will have a hearing, and there need be no doubt that the California Socialists will sustain the well-tried tactics of the Socialist movement.

Now let us consider the logic of the election returns. The advocates of the action finally taken by Los Angeles and San Francisco, contended, that "inasmuch as the Union Labor party has no State ticket, if the Socialist party does not antagonize the Union Labor party locally, it will mean a big vote for the Socialist State ticket." To see if this claim was justified, we will compare the Socialist vote of the three counties in which there were Union Labor party tickets, viz.: Alameda, Los Angeles and San Francisco. In our comparison we must take the vote cast this year for the head of the ticket, which is customarily taken to be the straight Socialist vote, and we must reckon from the vote cast for Debs and Harriman in 1900.

The defenders of San Francisco's action insist on reckoning from the big slump of 1901, when the Socialist candidate for mayor received but 955 votes, a loss of 1,061 votes from that cast for Debs and Harriman the year before. To allow them to so

reckon would be like claiming that a man who had climbed half way up a ladder and then fallen to the bottom, would be at the top as soon as he climbed back to the point from which he fell. San Francisco must reckon from the 1900 vote like the others in comparison.

Alameda County lies just across the bay from San Francisco. It contains the three cities of Oakland, Alameda and Berkeley. In this county the Union Labor party had a full county ticket, and was in close alliance with the Democratic party, getting its chief candidates therefrom; conditions similar to those of San Francisco. In this county the Socialist party nominated a full county ticket and made a square fight. It issued over 25,000 leaflets containing both the Socialist and Union Labor party platform, with an analysis and comparison. It treated the Union Labor party just as it treated the old parties.

Now the action of San Francisco had its influence upon the Socialist party in Alameda County. A few of the members of the local Oakland, to which the writer belongs, were opposed to antagonizing the Union Labor party. Local Alameda refused to circulate the leaflets named above. Hence the party in this county did not have complete unity of action.

In 1900 the vote for Debs and Harriman in Alameda County was 828, in Los Angeles 995, in San Francisco 2,016. The vote cast this year for Brower, candidate for Governor and head of the ticket, was, in Alameda County 1,009, a gain of 181 votes, or 21.86 per cent over the 1900 vote. Los Angeles cast 1,140 votes, a gain of 145, or 14.57 per cent; while San Francisco cast 1,993 votes, or 23 votes less than the vote for Debs. It is seen at once that compromise is not a prolific means of winning votes for the Socialist State ticket; that standing squarely for the Socialist party brought much better results.

In conclusion, here are some points well worth considering.

First: In the city of Alameda, where the local was careful not to antagonize the Union Labor party, and refused to circulate the Anti-Union Labor leaflet, there was a gain for the head of the Socialist State ticket of 11.8 per cent. In Oakland and Berkeley, where nearly 25,000 of said leaflets were circulated, the gain was sufficient to make a gain for the county of 21.86 per cent over the vote of 1900.

Second: In San Francisco, where great care was taken not to antagonize the Union Labor party, the vote fell short of the vote of 1900. In Los Angeles, where similar care was exercised, the gain was 14.57 per cent. In Alameda County, where a straight Socialist ticket was nominated, but where the results were slightly influenced by San Francisco's action, the gain was 21.86 per cent. But in the fifty-three other counties of the State, where there was

no compromise, and where the party was removed from the influence of compromise, the Socialist gain was great enough to overcome the backset in the three largest counties of the State, and make a gain for the whole State of 26.66 per cent over the vote of 1900. Query: Is it better for a revolutionary party to lay down or fight?

Finally, the writer will risk the following prophesy:

First: That the Socialist party of California in all succeeding campaigns, will be found standing pat for straight Socialism, with a full ticket in the field.

Second: That the Union Labor party as such will never again materialize in large proportions in this State. A party whose chief leader and oracle has assumed a half dozen political attitudes in a single year; a party that has a different platform in every county where it has a ticket; a party that denounces both old parties for their corruption and wrong principles, and then selects for its chief nominees men who have not yet cut loose from these old parties with their corruption and wrong principles; a party that professing to stand for the wage-workers, bemoans the turning down of Henry T. Gage, the Southern Pacific Railroad's candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket; a party that dare not stand for its principles in a State campaign this year for fear that defeat would discourage and destroy it, is not a party to be feared by any movement standing for grand realities.

M. W. Wilkins.

The Patriot.

THE Patriot anti-imperialist
On yonder lonely peak forlorn doth stand
With arms outstretched to God—a moralist
And teacher of the Past! His stern command
Unheeded falls upon his fellowmen;
His groans the Heavens rend—yet never touch
The souls of those he most entreats—for when
He weeps, they laugh and mock his cries!

—“Not much
Care ye for Freedom’s name when thus ye slay
Brown, Orient men to swell your dividends!
That I should live to see this shameful day!
For in a sea of blood the river ends
That started once a glorious stream! O may
These treach’rous deeds be writ upon the scroll
Of future minds as infamy! And e’er
My children’s children read them to extol—
May this fair land be blotted out! I fear
My country’s future while I love her name:
No more her stars and stripes I care to see
Upon the morning breeze! I sink with shame—
And cry unto my God on bended knee—
Yet no man heeds—nor does my God
Incline his ear to me.”

The Patriot hides his face within his hands—
And shuddering—hears the click of telegraph,
As great commercial lords give their commands
And bid him fall before the Golden Calf—
As brutal Commerce seated on her throne
This message gives by way of telephone:—

SONG OF THE TRUSTS.

In the market—on the street—
Tidings bring of price of wheat;
Price of copper—price of gold—
Price of steel and iron cold!
Price of mutton and beef
Higher soars beyond belief!
Price of corn and sugar sweet—

- Price of all you want to eat!—
Price of coal in tiny pail—
For the poor no larger scale
Than they carry on the arm—
'Tis enough to keep them warm!
From that pail our profits come—
Let the poor pay thrice the sum!
Up and up the prices go—
We the Trusts will have them so!

In the war across the seas,
Tell that Patriot on his knees
We can shoot the fellows down
While he prays for black and brown!
We have made this war for gain!
Let him go and pray for rain!
God is ever on the side
Of the money-bags that ride
High upon the backs of poor
Workingmen—you may be sure!
This our answer to his prayers—
Let him flout us if he dares!

Upon his feet the Patriot stands once more
Wild-eyed and speechless. Then with haggard face
Turned from the sight of Wall Street's open door—
And all the horrors of that Market Place—
A sound he hears upon the evening breeze—
A softly whispered sigh that fills the air
Yet scarcely stirs a leaf upon the trees—
A human sigh of weariness and care!
It is a sigh from factory, mill and mine
Department store and railroads' length along,
From laborers who stand and seek a sign
Of better things in store to right their wrong...
While handing back their product with a moan
And all their children in exchange for bread!

Now rustling murmurs from the trees are blown —
The wind has changed! Around the Patriot's head
Soft zephyrs play, strange music doth he hear;
From distant mountain tops hoarse voices sing
A noble anthem until disappear
Those sighing moans of men!
Then slowly ring
Those voices in a chant with words most clear:—

SONG OF LABOR.

I.

Go—bind your wounded hearts, O ye
Who stand and weep for liberty!
The freedom that you weeping mourn
For us has never yet been born;
For us no poet sings the morn
To cheer us with his ecstasy!

This is the land of patriots who
Have ever cherished for the few
The vision that the many knew
For them was but a mockery!

The sigh of Labor you have heard
Is but an echo of the word
That sweeps along like frightened bird
Before the winds of destiny!

Around the world that sigh extends!
It has no meaning till it lends
Its broken note to higher ends
Than plaintive songs of poverty!

A thousand Christs upon the hills
Of Calvary to bear our ills—
By power of their celestial wills
And all their sweet divinity—

Could not in suffering take our place,
Or by their sacred tears displace
What we have given to the race—
We are the sons of Calvary!

Go—bind your wounded hearts, O ye
Who take a word for liberty!
'Tis but a name! When was it known
To make atonement if a stone
Was offered us for daily bread?

In Orient lands, another name
Ye give to those who build their fame
On highway robbery! The same
Oppressing hands have always bled

The poor at home of all they made!
Now 'cross the seas they boldly raid
Those lovely isles that long have paid
The robbers' price with gallant dead.

II.

Across the blackened ages past
We see ourselves in truth at last;
We stand and look—and are aghast—
And wonder at the mystery!

For kings we swung the battle-axe:
We paid in blood a heavier tax
Than all the knights upon our backs
With all their pomp and chivalry!

For them we fixed our arrow true:
For them we aimed—the bow we drew—
Nor reasoned why—nor asked or knew—
Our brothers in the sunlight slew—
And with their blood wrote history.

The death of yeomen as a game
Our masters thought too dear when came
The manufacturer's day and fame—
Then marched we to the factory!

We took the thread and wove the cloth;
We built machines and pledged our troth
To make the goods for South or North—
We ate but little—and our broth
Was payment for our industry.

We mined the coal—we wrought the steel—
We taught the elements to kneel
Before the swift revolving wheel—
A meager, living wage we drew!

We strapped the continent with rails
And bound together hills and dales;
We held them fast with iron nails—
We builded better than we knew!

We spanned the river with a bridge
And tunneled through the mountain ridge—

We built the old—we built the new—
We built all things so strong and true!
We built them not for us but you!

III.

Yet all we built we only lent!
We never surely could have meant
Those treasures from the firmament—
Like Juggernauts with cruel intent—
To crush us in our discontent
And swell the gains of cornered stocks!

Far better to have left the rocks
Where Nature placed them—in her box—
Than ever to have picked her locks
And from her quarries torn the blocks
As monuments to human greed!

We builded for the human race!
As Master Builders by the grace
Of God we hold the title-deed
That every one who runs may read!

Behold the spirit of Labor! We
Have all things made: our destiny
Outrunning ancient prophecy
Shall build man's goodness to the skies!
Behold the spirit of Labor rise!
Behold the face of Liberty!

Slow rising from the valley's depth is seen
A cloudy mist of strange gigantic form;
Upon its crest a white and silvery sheen
As tho' the sunlight and the shadowy storm
Had met! So piercing are those glorious beams
Of light—all conquered is the sullen gloom!
And dazzled are the Patriot's eyes! It seems
As if before him now distinctly loom
The outlines of a shape that line by line
Majestically human grows! Benign
It stands revealed in sunlight—then divine—
With face celestial looking out from space!
Then falls the Patriot awed upon his face
And cries with all his soul in ecstasy:—
"It is the face of Liberty I see!"

The face of Labor beautiful and free!
The face of Labor glorified as Art!
O Spirit of Labor! Look forgivingly
On me—I know thee now—thou art
‘The Christ that is to be!’ ”

Caroline Pemberton.

EDITORIAL

Trade Unions and the Socialist Party.

A combination of events has forced the question of the attitude of the Socialist party toward the trade union movement prominently to the front. Unfortunately the relation of these two expressions of the class struggle are complicated by some unfortunate historical conditions. With these, however, we do not care to deal at this time, save that we wish to protest against those who would explain the present conditions entirely by the somewhat trite saying that the "pendulum" is only swinging to the other extreme."

The situation which confronts us at the present time in several portions of the country is about as follows: Under the combined influence of economic development and Socialist teachings the trade unions have simultaneously become of great strength and permeated with Socialist thought, the latter generally of a rather indefinite and confused character. The cry that labor must go into politics is taken up. A "union labor" ticket is placed in the field. The Socialist party is at once confronted with the alternative as to whether it shall antagonize this "union labor" party, or whether it shall withdraw from the field.

Various comrades have by a process of what one might call "short-circuited" reasoning (to borrow a phrase from the vocabulary of the electrician) jumped to the conclusion that the Socialist party is at once compelled to make terms with the Union Labor party, even at the cost of the complete sacrifice of the Socialist party itself. Their reasoning generally runs something as follows:

The philosophy of Socialism demands that the powers of government be captured by a working class party. Here is a working class party. It can capture the powers of government. That would be Socialism; let us support it. Unfortunately there are several breaks in this chain of reasoning. The weakest point, of course, lies in the claim that any party bearing the name of labor, and largely made up of organized workers, is necessarily a working class party. In the sense in which Socialists use the word, a working class party means, not so much a party made up of working men as one based upon certain definite principles in accord with the interests of the working class. If the working class membership is the only condition, there has scarcely been a party in existence that could not fill the bill. Hence, an argument based upon the fact that these parties are made up of laboring men, whether organized or unorganized, is utterly beside the point and has nothing whatever to do with the matter in question.

The fact that it is even offered by a Socialist shows a badly confused state of mind.

The only thing which determines whether a party is a working class party in the sense in which the Socialists use the word is whether it stands upon a platform expressing the mission of the working class as the future ruling class, and whether the attitude and spirit of the new party indicates that it is inspired by a consciousness of the functions of the working class as the collective owners of the instruments of production and distribution and the rulers of the social organism.

Judging by these standards not one of the so-called "union labor" parties has any right whatever to be called a working class party. Their principles are much more in accord with small capitalist interests than with those of the working class.

It is useless to point out that such parties are distinguished from the Republican and Democratic parties by the fact that the initiative comes from members of the working class themselves. This argument shows a very slight understanding of social psychology. To the superficial observer the initiative may appear to come from organized labor, but as a matter of fact it comes from the thoughts, printed matter and miscellaneous ideas that have been circulated by divisions of the capitalist class through the organs by which they control public opinion.

An example of this method of reasoning is given in the article by Comrade Murray in this issue, where he says: "But dare we condemn the instincts of the working class, for what other class, what other individuals but the workers themselves are better fitted to understand the needs of the working class and to bring about their salvation?" But that is just what the Socialist party always has and always must do until it has succeeded in making the working class thoroughly class-conscious. The "instinct of the working class," if it means anything means the ideas which have been communicated to the working class by the capitalist, and action in accordance therewith is almost always against the working class, except when it comes in the line of direct reaction from physical discomfort, as is the case with the economic side of the trade union movement.

Furthermore, even when the Union Labor party stands upon a professedly Socialist platform, there is no reason why the Socialist party should leave the field, or should renounce its name and organization.

The Socialist party is a national and international organization like the capitalism which it combats. The Union Labor party is almost invariably a municipal party, never more than a State party. The capture either of a municipality or a State would not be any very serious blow to capitalism while the more general powers of government remained untouched. Furthermore, such a capture at the expense of the disorganization of a wider party movement would be a dearly gained victory even if it were gained along Socialist lines.

In all this we see an exaggeration of the importance of the organized labor movement. There is not the slightest question but what the Socialist party is and always must be on the side of organized labor when the latter is waging a class struggle, but it is equally on the side of such workers as the toilers in the sweat shops and the child slaves in the factory, the agricultural laborers and a mass of others

far outnumbering those within the unions, for whom there is practically no possibility of organization.

So far from the Socialist party being but a side show to the trade union movement, as some of the members seem to think, the Socialist party, the Socialist movement and the Socialist philosophy are all infinitely greater than any trade union movement. There is not a point of the trade union movement which is not swallowed up and enlarged by the Socialist movement, and to let "the tail wag the dog" in the manner in which some comrades advocate would be a most ridiculous conclusion.

Even as a vote getter fusion is not a success. Comrade Wilkins in this number shows very conclusively the truth of this for California. Missouri was the only other State in which there was a tendency to subordinate Socialism to trade unionism, and this is the only State so far as we are aware where the Socialist vote has absolutely fallen off. This decline comes in spite of the fact that the national headquarters is located in that State, with all the advertising and assistance that this implies.

And apropos of this reference to national headquarters, it seems to us that in regard to other comrades this question of fusion is one on which they might act as their judgment might dictate, unhampered by any restriction. But when men who have been elected to take charge of the national destinies of the Socialist party deliberately send out letters indorsing the absorption of that party by other organizations, it indicates that the senders have a very low idea of personal honor in relation to their official position. If they had become firmly convinced that the time was now here for the Socialist party to take a back seat for some other organization, whether that organization be a trade union, or an independent labor party, they should first surrender the machinery of the Socialist party which has been entrusted to them.

To return to the argument. Comrade Hoehn, in his article in this issue, says he does not "recognize any such thing as a pure and simple or Socialist trade union." If he does not recognize them that is his fault, for they exist. While it is true, as he says, that resolutions by central organizations do not make Socialists, and indeed we are glad that there seems to be at least one member of the National Committee who recognizes this fact, as their actions would have given a contrary impression, yet there is a great difference from the point of view of the Socialist party between a union whose machinery of administration is used for the furtherance of Socialism and one in which that machinery is used to fight Socialism in the bitterest possible manner.

In conclusion it must be borne in mind that the Socialist party is a party of the working class and not of any fraction thereof. That to-day, if we are going to give up that class character which rests upon principle, it would be much less of a surrender to indorse the Allied party, which is made up equally of the laboring class and which has much more of a Socialist platform than has the Trade Union parties of some cities. But to do either would be a complete surrender of our position. The Socialist party can have nothing in common with any organization which supports and cringes before a man like Eugene Schmitz, immediately after he has come from the defense of Tam-

many Hall, and who has given no reason whatever to believe that he has accepted any of the principles of the working class movement.

We are not of those who think that this fusion movement is of such tremendous importance. Like the measles and the whooping cough in human beings, it is a disease which seems to affect the Socialist party in every country at certain stages of its development. We can only hope that it will not become epidemic in this country and that the acute stage may be quickly passed, because while it lasts there will be little effective Socialist work. The only unfortunate thing about it is that it has infected our national headquarters, which would seem to indicate that it was about time to make a selection of a more healthful locality for this body.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Germany.

One of the survivals of feudal ignorance in the penal code of the German empire is paragraph 175, making so-called "unnatural vices" a criminal offense. The Socialists have often pointed out that modern science shows such abnormities to be pathological phenomena which belong to the field of the physician, not of the criminal judge. Capitalist morality, however, has never permitted the repeal of paragraph 175, and countless unfortunates have thus been under the constant fear of criminal persecution for practices that were the result of abnormal physical conditions.

It was with a view of protecting these victims of physical and social laws that "Vorwaerts," after a careful investigation of the actual facts, disclosed the sensational secret that Alfred Krupp, the "cannon king" of Essen, was one of these unfortunates and had selected the island of Capri, off Naples, for a refuge. The Italian criminal code, the only one in Europe without a paragraph 175, made this island the favorite haunt of such people, and it was only when public opinion became aroused that the Italian government gave Krupp a hint to leave the country. He died suddenly in his villa "Huegel" in Essen, shortly after Vorwaerts had made these disclosures, and it is still a matter of doubt whether he died of apoplexy or committed suicide.

In making this disclosure, the "Vorwaerts" plainly stated its reasons and again urged the repeal of paragraph 175. Nevertheless, the issue was confiscated by the police and a criminal prosecution against the responsible editor begun. The majority of the capitalist press at once proceeded to incite the public against what they termed the "vile calumnies" of the Socialist organ. Even the tragic death of the unfortunate man did not prevent the political press from making capital out of the incident for their grasping schemes. They even went so far as to charge the "Vorwaerts" with causing the death of the cannon king. The official autopsy, however, declared the death of Krupp to be due to brain paralysis, in consequence of a chronic enlargement of the vital organs.

Nevertheless, the capitalist press continued its scurrilous attacks and insinuations. Only exceptionally independent papers remained calm and discussed the case on its merits. Said the liberal "Munchener Neuesten Nachrichten": The process against the "Vorwaerts" is causing a great stir, as well on account of the personality of the man whom the Socialist organ has thus charged, as on account of the sudden and

energetic interference of the state prosecutor. The latter has hardly ever acted so quickly before, when a private individual was concerned.

* * * It is pertinent to ask whether the state would also lend its aid to any less known and less wealthy private individual, against any paper that would publish any insulting or incriminating charges about him. We believe that in the case of any Mr. X or Y the public prosecution would remember paragraph 416 of the criminal rules, which says: "A public prosecution on account of the criminal offenses named in paragraph 414 is instituted only then when the public interest demands it." But we ask in vain, What public interest was affected in the case of Krupp? Public morality? The article of "Vorwaerts" was written very carefully and certainly did not dwell on those unpleasant matters any more, in reality even less, than is done in many reports of horrible crimes or police reports dealing with immoral offenses. "Vorwaerts" could not dare to give any sensational or "piquant" tinge to its disclosures for tactical reasons: For it pursued by its statements the humane purpose of contributing to the repeal of paragraph 175 of the penal code, which prosecutes in Germany such practices as Krupp is said to have indulged in on the island of Capri.

Another public statement remarkable for its objectivity is that of the "Scientific Humanitarian Committee of Berlin and Leipzig," which declares:

"In connection with the case of Krupp the opinion has frequently been voiced that it is a grave insult to charge any one with being addicted to homo-sexual practices. Without entering into the question whether Alfred Krupp was homo-sexual or not, the 'Scientific Humanitarian Committee' protests energetically against this opinion in the name of more than 1,500 homo-sexuals whose character and moral conduct are as honorable as that of sexually normal persons. The committee demands that humanitarian consequences be drawn from scientific investigations, in order that the fatal errors which have made social victims of constitutionally homo-sexual persons may at last be avoided."

The German emperor was present at the burial of Krupp and made an impassioned speech in which he charged the Socialists with besmirching the reputation of honorable men and ended with inciting the working men of the Krupp works to class hatred against their class-conscious fellow workers. The "Vorwaerts" took the emperor to task for this speech, declaring that he was anticipating the prosecuting attorney without being acquainted with the facts in the case.

As the capitalist press continued to flow over with praises of the energy, business talent, and magnanimity of the deceased, "Vorwaerts" made a number of disclosures about the "generosity" of Krupp, among which the following deserve special attention:

The firm of Krupp had built several thousand houses for its workmen, which they rented at a moderate price. This gave them not only a means of keeping the employes under constant supervision, but also the advantage of depriving them of their shelter on a moment's notice, whenever they showed a disposition to rebel against the feudal regulations of the establishment.

The firm maintained a number of stores which sold their goods to

the employes at current prices and returned a certain discount to them at the end of each year. This discount, amounting to from 6 to 7 per cent, was computed on the first of July and paid in December. But this discount was by no means paid to all of the employes. Those who left the employ of the firm voluntarily or involuntarily lost this discount completely. Even in the most favorable case, when a man left after receiving the discount in December, he still lost the whole discount from July to December. In other words, these company stores were only another means of exerting a material pressure on the employes.

The crowning "benevolent institution" of Krupps was the employes' pension fund. It was indeed highly benevolent—to the company. It was compulsory for every employe to contribute to this fund. The admission fee amounted to one and a half times the daily wage, on an average to six mark. The current contributions amounted to 2½ per cent of the wages, making a total contribution of about 35 mark per year for workingmen. In order to be in line for the benefits of this fund a man had to be in the service of the company for twenty years without interruption, and his complete invalidity had to be certified by two physicians. In computing the time of service, the period of employment before the eighteenth year is not counted, but contributions for this time must be paid just the same. Spells of sickness longer than thirteen weeks and employment as a partial invalid are not taken into consideration. All who leave or are discharged before the twentieth year do not receive a cent. And an enormous number of employes left every year. Any attempt to have an independent political opinion or to belong to a trade union was at once punished by discharge. The total so discharged amounted to seven or eight thousand a year. Under these circumstances, an enormous surplus flowed back to the company, which amounted to almost half of the contributions paid by the employes. With a total membership of 25,882 and a total contribution of 2,246,000 mark, the surplus amounted to about 1,167,000 mark. "Indeed," says "Vorwaerts," "a more refined, one is tempted to say, a better swindling system for the exploitation of workingmen under the guise of benevolence could not be devised." It is plain that the employes did not like to lose the great sums which they had contributed, and so they became meek and soulless subjects of the feudal despotism of the Krupp firm. This system finally became so oppressive that five protest meetings were held by the employes during last year, in which resolutions were passed demanding legal protection against the benevolent "pension fund." A telegram sent by one of these meetings to Krupp in Capri was never answered. Such was the benevolence of the Krupp firm.

"The capitalist press," says "Vorwaerts," "are celebrating Krupp as one of the great men of the world. But it is only their bad conscience that causes this wild disturbance. For no case is so well calculated to tear the mask of divine superiority from the faces of the exploiters as that of the late Krupp, whose position in his giant establishment had less meaning than that of the least laborer. * * * It is plain that the exploiters are not pleased to have it demonstrated how absolutely superfluous Krupp was in the organization of that enormous

undertaking. And it is the irony of it all that just those papers who are praising him most have spread the news that the income of the firm increased most after he had withdrawn from active management."

The attitude of the Socialists in this question, compared to the mean and low standard of the capitalist press comment, is so superior that even so conservative a man as Professor Mommsen, the famous historian, has declared "the only element in present society worthy of esteem are the Socialists."

The anarchist methods of the agrarians and clericals in the Reichstag have done much to open the eyes of the German people to the true condition of affairs. Indeed, the recent proceedings in the Reichstag mark a new epoch in the history of that country and will certainly produce radical changes in the sentiment of the majority of the intelligent voters of that country. And the oppressors see the danger.

"Right Honorable Sir!

"The Social Democracy received in the Reichstag's elections votes: 1881, 312,000; 1884, 550,000; 1887, 763,000; 1890, 1,427,000; 1893, 1,787,000; 1898, 2,212,000, and would probably poll two and one-half millions votes in the coming Reichstag's election if its growth only remained the same. But the Socialists expect to poll 3,000,000 votes, at least, so their leaders have declared at the national convention in Munich. The Socialist party will then contest the second ballot in still more election precincts than in 1898 and expects to win out, in consequence of the greater intensity of industrial, denominational and national antagonisms between the non-Socialist parties, even in those precincts where such a possibility was not given before.

"Unfortunately, we must, therefore, anticipate a considerable increase of Socialist representatives in the Reichstag, who now number 58, and thus a greater influence of this party, which is already strongly felt in the Reichstag. What a danger it would be to have the Socialists assume a dominating position in the Reichstag needs no explanation.

"To forestall this danger with all our strength is a duty which is dictated by national, social, industrial and ethical motives."

This is the introduction of a secret circular signed by the leaders of the feudal nobility and industrial plutocracy, and appealing to the capitalist elements for contributions to a fund of 300,000 mark for the purpose of publishing and distributing eight million pamphlets against Socialism. The "Vorwaerts" publishes the circular in full with all the signatures and invites the comrades to contribute a million mark for the purpose of publishing and distributing answers to the capitalist pamphlets, which "Vorwaerts" has also secured.

The campaign documents of the exploiters and their methods in the Reichstag are eloquent proofs how fearlessly and successfully the Socialists have defended the interests of the working class. And this defense of the oppressed finally became so unbearable to the exploiters that they had to exclaim with Odilon Barrot, "La legalite nous tue," and the only way to avoid defeat was to make parliamentaryism a farce. All the attempts of the Socialists to amend the proposed "usury tariff" in the interest of the working class were voted down, and when the proceedings threatened to become endless and make the passage

of the bill during the present term impossible, the majority simply changed the order of business and decided to adopt the whole tariff en bloc.

The Socialists were not slow to impress on the majority the consequences of such a step. "Never have I so much regretted as to-day," said Comrade Singer, "that neither the constitution nor the order of business contain a clause excluding all those members of the House from participation in the vote whose material interests are concerned in any bill under consideration. Without such a material interest, this new move would never have been made. It is the result of the personal interest which the gentlemen lawmakers have in the passing of the tariff bill. The whole country is unanimous in recognizing that such proceedings do not inspire any confidence in the majority. You charge us with aiming at the downfall of the existing order, but it is you who are making a revolution, a reactionary revolution for the purpose of trampling on the rights of the people, of making the rich still richer and the poor still poorer. This last motion completely tears the mask from the faces of the majority."

And Comrade Bebel thundered this warning into their ears: "It cannot be disputed that a revolution will again become necessary if the oppressed masses are deprived of every vestige of right, if disfranchisement, laws of exception and suppression of all opposition again become a fact. No nation will stand that. But this revolution will be made by a mass of men whose education and organization have never been equaled in history. We are sincerely willing to avoid such a disaster. For this reason alone do we enter this parliament and endeavor to make laws together with you that will prevent the oppression of the masses and ameliorate the condition of the working class as much as possible."

The Reichstag, already in a state of intense excitement, seemed temporarily on the verge of a riot when one of the speakers of the Center party, Mr. Bachem, intimated that the Socialists had made disparaging remarks about the radical allies, which alone assisted them in the opposition against the majority. The Socialists insisted that Bachem should openly declare what they had said, but he refused to prove the truth of his assertion. The excitement and the noise became so great that the presiding officer of the Reichstag had to suspend the session for half an hour.

This is the first time in the history of the German Reichstag that such a step became necessary, and the capitalist press is vociferously condemning the Socialists and blaming them for this "disgraceful incident." Disgraceful for whom?

Among the main agitators against the Socialists is now the German emperor. Perhaps he thinks it is time for him to throw his own weight in the scale and use his fancied influence on the German workmen to stem the tide of the threatening revolution. How great, or how little, his influence actually is will be seen at the next Reichstag's elections. The Kaiser party, which is to wrest the victory from the hands of the class-conscious workmen, will need nothing so much as votes. And recent press dispatches state, besides, that the emperor has decided to introduce a bill for the disfranchisement of the majority

of workmen. Will not that disfranchise the voters of the Kaiser party also? Even the young crown prince has joined his father in the campaign against the "vaterlandslose Rotte," and has had the pleasure of receiving the tribute of the Socialists and Radicals in the form of the advice to go back to school and learn something before he opens his mouth.

Numerous meetings all over the country are violently protesting against the emperor's attitude, and the coming campaign bids fair to throw the land into a state of white heat. Of all the political parties, the Socialist party alone can view the coming struggle with equanimity. The capitalist press is forced to acknowledge that the Socialists are using the illegal proceedings of the Reichstag majority as a successful means of agitation. The last municipal elections in Stettin and Fuerth have again brought victories to the Socialists. Five of the eight Socialist candidates were elected in Stettin, and six of the united Socialists and Democrats in Fuerth, while the Socialist vote in Nuernberg drove all the capitalist parties together into one cartel. Wonder what Comrade Bernstein thinks now about the decreasing intensity of class antagonisms? The last scenes in the Reichstag should serve as very impressive lessons to him and to all who believe that the transition from capitalism to Socialism will be accomplished without an intensification of the class struggle.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

If the commission investigating the late coal strike does nothing more than to expose the bare-faced thievery and cannibalism of the coal barons it will have served a good purpose, and Clarence Darrow and Henry D. Lloyd deserve great credit for pushing the sanctimonious scoundrels to the wall.

James Gallagher, who worked in the Markle mines for thirty years, testified that the wages were so low that he was always indebted to the company and that in seventeen years he only once received money in wages, and that was \$50. He further testified that he had to deal at the company store, the only place where the miners could get credit, and that the prices were from 10 to 20 per cent higher than in other places. He said he has made large wages and wiped out his debt, but the company would then give him such bad workings that he would immediately get into debt again. He was evicted from his house and refused work, but he did not know why employment was not given him. Gallagher didn't experience wage-slavery, mind you. He didn't receive wages. He was like an old horse or a felon a century ago—he was on a tread-mill, treading out dollars for the Markles, big and little. But these old fat plutes had other victims. A 12-year-old breaker boy testified that he was working at the Markle mines to pay off the debt incurred by his father, who was killed in the mines eighteen months ago. He received no pay, but was given due bills, showing how much his mother owed the company. The due bills also showed that the debt his mother was incurring, such as house rent, etc., was growing more than he could reduce it, as he was only getting 4 cents an hour. The little boy was making no progress on the tread-mill; it was slipping backward under his feet, and the Markles stood around and grinned and feasted and went to the opera and to the seashore, and old age and youth, extremes, and others like them plodded and drudged and coined their sweat and blood into dollars that a few parasites, a few social lice, might roll in luxurious ease and comfort. Two other interesting witnesses were John McGlone, a weigh master of the Pennsylvania Coal Company, and Edward Ridgway, a docking boss in the employ of the Temple Iron & Coal Company. Mr. McGlone presented statistics to show that his company secured over seventeen thousand tons of coal during the past year for which the miners did not receive one cent. The coal was "docked"—in plain language, **STOLEN!** Mr. Ridgway stated that he had orders from his company to dock the miners 5 per cent of all the coal produced, no matter whether it contained slate or not, and besides this the miners were

compelled to fill cars eighteen inches higher than the law allowed. These illustrations may be exceptional cases of capitalistic exploitation, but it is difficult to determine in what degree, and they show plainly enough what is possible under private ownership of land and capital. No doubt such infamies are practiced in many other lines of industry, and they show conclusively that the capitalists are the most dangerous anarchists in the country. The Socialist ballot is the only weapon with which to knock the rapacious greed out of these modern cannibals.

No doubt the daily press will be pretty busy this month chronicling the harvest of the trust magnates, and the coupon-clippers will be loud in their praise of the record-breaking era of prosperity that was marked by the year 1902. The Wall street organs, as though to reassure the dear people that the combines will not squeeze the life out of them altogether, but are becoming quite tame, send out the glad tidings that there was not as much capitalization as last year. They do not add that fewer trusts were organized for the reason that nearly everything in sight worth cornering has been combined. The play now is largely to amalgamate the trusts and draw in independent competitors. Thus the United States Steel Corporation is swallowing concerns so rapidly that it is fattening to the two billion dollar mark. The two big plants of the Union Steel Company have been absorbed for \$45,000,000. They are composed of wire, rod, nail and other works, and when fully completed will have five modern blast furnaces and twenty-five open-hearth furnaces, with a capacity of 7,500 kegs of nails daily, and new and modern tube mills, bar mills, tin mills, sheet mills, plate mills, etc. They also control 5,000 acres of coking coal land, 6,200 acres of fuel coal, railways, steel cars, two lake steamers, 40,000,000 tons of ore in the Mesaba range, limestone and other valuable properties. Besides playing this master stroke in securing control of the iron and steel industry, Morgan is now reaching into Kentucky to obtain possession of the soft coal mines of that State and add to his properties in Pennsylvania, Ohio and other States. Then the railways have nearly all been grouped in five great systems, at the head of which is that controlled by Morgan dominating over 50,000 miles, not counting his new Southern merger that will include another 10,000 miles when completed. Morgan's transatlantic ship combine is now experiencing smooth sailing, while some of the independent lines are seriously considering the question of allowing themselves to be swallowed rather than bankrupted. So the new year is starting out gloriously with nearly everything trustified and coming under the control of a few hundred captains of industry, so even a blind man can see there is great prosperity—for the captains. And there is more to come.

The National Association of Manufacturers has issued a "declaration of war." Its President Parry, whose headquarters are in Indianapolis, has issued two secret circulars to the large employers of the country urging them to join his organization and extend all possible assistance to prevent the passage of the anti-injunction and eight-hour bills before Congress and to conduct their business without the aid or consent of any other body. These circulars were latterly followed by a scathing arraignment of organized labor and its officials, which was scattered broadcast by the capitalistic press, in which Mr. Parry de-

clares that the eight-hour day is wholly impractical and is "the result of Socialistic agitation in Europe;" that it is instigated by self-appointed leaders bent on creating mischief, and that those same individuals have attacked the church and the militia and want to overthrow all law, but "the employers of this country do not propose that such an anarchistic element shall ever have charge of the destinies of the United States." This is the same Parry who, when the manufacturers were being squeezed by coal barons during the miners' strike, rushed off to Buffalo and Philadelphia and had a conference with Mitchell in which he attempted to coax the strikers to return to work to save the employers from ruin. His newspaper interviewers announced that the interests of labor and capital are identical, and he was deeply pained to learn that labor was injuring industry. There is no denying the fact that the N. A. of M. is growing in power and making itself felt, and the organized workers have got to make up their minds to meet this combination of employers who seem to be determined on smashing unions. It is worthy of notice that the treasurer of this new association is a Detroit clothing manufacturer who has long posed as a philanthropist and "workingman's friend," and has received considerable free advertising in the labor press as a person worthy of patronage.

Just as though the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L. had never been held and determined the jurisdiction controversy between the seamen on the one side and the cooks and waiters on the other, the former held their convention in Milwaukee during the past month, and decided to charter the Buffalo cooks employed on lake vessels. In the Federation convention it was declared that a cook is a cook, and is not expected to run aloft and wave a beefsteak as a signal, because the cook comes ashore during the winter months to tickle the palates of landlubbers, and for that reason ought to be under control of the hotel and restaurant employees' organization, so that a standard rate of wages and hours can be enforced. The action of the seamen is a clear violation of the mandates of the trade unions in convention assembled, sets a bad example to other organizations that are involved in jurisdiction squabbles, and comes with bad grace from a body whose representatives have constantly posed as being the par excellence of trade unionism and the embodiment of loyalty to the Federation. I might mention that Mr. Andrew Furuseth is the spokesman of the seamen in Federation conventions, as well as one of the floor leaders of the administration, and for a number of years he has been stationed at Washington as the A. F. of L.'s representative to secure the passage of

ed in behalf of the organized workers. Mr. Furuseth backward in his conservatism that he is actually reactionary. It is not surprising that he has deliberately jumped, board. He is an authority on maritime laws, the edicts of Czar and Sultan of Turkey, and knows all about ancient history, but his notions about industrial and political the working class are peculiar, to say the least. Of hotel and restaurant employees will fight the sea cooks and other relatives when they land, and it remains to be triumph. But the point that a good many trade unionists closely is whether the seamen will receive the same

drastic treatment that was meted out to the brewers and amalgamated engineers, which are radical and not reactionary organizations.

President Gompers has sent out a call to the unions to renew their agitation in favor of the eight-hour bill and to demand of Senators from their States that they vote for it. But dispatches from Washington say there is little hope for the passage of the eight-hour bill or any other labor measure during the present session of Congress. A number of Senators have declared openly that the eight-hour bill is "dangerous" and that they intend to fight it if it comes on the floor. Senator Proctor, of the capitalistic and rock-ribbed Republican State of Vermont, declares that he will make a speech against the bill every day until the close of the session if necessary, and several dyed-in-the-wool Democrats from the South have expressed similar sentiments, while the statesmen on the fence from close States applaud them liberally in the hope that they won't drop into a hole. The opponents of the proposed law say it would work great hardship on American manufacturers, and point to the "pernicious effects" of the eight-hour movement in Great Britain, whose capitalists are losing in the scramble for the world's markets—probably because American labor works longer and harder, and therefore proportionately cheaper than the Englishman. The capitalists are maneuvering shrewdly, and they lay great stress upon the alleged fact that this is not a political question, but "a plain business proposition," you understand, and ought to be dealt with from a non-partisan standpoint. The Senators look wise and say amen, and the Southern Democrat declares solemnly with the Northern Republican that nothing must be done to cripple our industries, and endanger our free institutions and soil the flag. No; they, as great American patriots, will rise above party lines and consider this matter from the broad standpoint of the best interests of "all the people," and, since "all the people" are not as yet working but eight hours per day, why enact special legislation for a class? It is doubtful, however, whether the eight-hour bill will even come to a vote. There are so many tricks that can be worked, besides keeping the bill in a committee's pigeon-hole, that it is next to useless to expect a discussion on its merits. Capitalism will not even make that concession. It controls labor's vote and doesn't have to yield anything.

BOOK REVIEWS

Social Problems of the Farmer. Publication of the Michigan Political Science Association. Paper, 159 pp., \$1.

This is a compilation of the papers read at a joint meeting of the Michigan Political Science Association and the Michigan Farmers' Institutes. It is significant first as showing the growth of interest in rural sociology, and, second, for the large amount of really good material it contains for the student of such problems. Although some of the papers are decidedly academic and repeat generalizations based on popular truisms, yet on the whole it is all that could have been expected from what is practically the first attempt in this field. Some idea of the attitude taken by one of the speakers is furnished by the remark of J. L. Synder in the opening paper on "The Economic Value of Industrial Education" that "we have outstripped other countries with cheaper labor because we had a better supply of intellectual labor." He will not be quite so frank in appealing to capitalist slave-buying instincts in the future when those who listen to him come to be able to understand the real import of such statements. Henry C. Adams in "Higher Education and the People" gathers together much valuable information concerning the benefits of scientific research, but neglects to notice that the majority of these benefits have been monopolized by the ruling class. Charles H. Cooley contributes some statistical information in regard to specific localities in Michigan concerning "The Decrease of Rural Population," but when he comes to causes he could have found all that he says and many times as much more in any one of half a dozen Socialist writers of the last fifty years. The same sort of criticism might be made of all the papers. They are the best things that have yet been gathered together in English on the study of various rural problems, but all of them leave one with the feeling that the authors are themselves by no means sure of their positions, save in one or two instances where ignorance has grown arrogant.

Resist Not Evil. Clarence S. Darrow. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 179 pp., 75 cents.

This is a work that is bound to challenge attention whatever may be thought of its logic. The very strength of the language and beauty of the literary style entitle it to a place among the really great books of the year.

The thesis of the book is that forcible restraint will not abolish evil or lessen its effects. Taking as "the fundamental principle that the

conduct which makes for life is wise and right" he proceeds to show that authority and compulsion is never wise nor right. No one has set forth more clearly and emphatically the Socialist position in regard to the class nature of present governments. "Civil governments, like military governments, are instituted and controlled by the ruling class. Their purpose is to keep the earth and its resources in the hand of those who directly or indirectly have taken it for themselves." It is for this purpose that armies and navies are maintained. "In reality the prime reason for all the armies of the world is that soldiers and militia may turn their guns upon their unfortunate countrymen when the owners of the earth shall speak the word. And these unfortunate countrymen are the outcast and despised, the meek and lowly ones of the world, the men whose ceaseless toil and unpaid efforts have built the forts and molded the cannon and sustained the soldiers that are used to shoot them down. * * * The purpose of guns and armies is to furnish the few an easy and sure way to control the mass. Neither are these armies made of the ruling class. The officers, it is true, are generally taken from the favored ones, but the regular soldier is the man too poor and abandoned to find his place in any other of the walks of life. He is only fit to be an executioner of his fellow man. * * * That this is the real purpose of standing armies and warlike equipments is plain to all who have eyes to see. More and more the rulers have learned to build their barracks and mass their troops, not on the borders of their land but convenient to great cities, in the midst of districts thickly populated by working men. * * * These soldiers are moved from place to place, are massed at time of need, not in accordance with the petition of the citizens from whose ranks the soldiers come, but in response to the request of the ruling class.

But it is in the treatment of crime and punishment that we find the strongest portion of the book. Here the position of Ferri and the Socialist school of criminologists, that crime is an economic phenomena, are pushed to their logical conclusion. The theory which lies at the base of all our present class-made criminal laws, that the criminal is inherently bad, is attacked and refuted at every point. The utter futility of legal punishment to check the acts at which it is aimed is demonstrated beyond dispute. Here again the class nature of criminal legislation appears. "Nearly our whole criminal code is made up of what may be called property crimes, or crimes against property, if they may be so called. * * * Nothing could more completely show the humbuggery, knavery and the absolute hypocrisy of all punishment by the state than the patent facts with reference to these crimes. From first to last these inmates of jail and penitentiary, these suffering outcast men are utterly without property and have ever been. In the penal institutions of the world are confined a motley throng charged with committing assaults upon property, and yet this whole mass of despised and outcast humanity have ever been the propertyless class, have never had aught whereon to lay their heads. But where is all the property that has been the subject of these dire assaults? No matter where you turn your eyes in the world, the whole property is in the hands of a chosen few, and the so-called owners of all this wealth created by the labor of man and the bounty of nature—these so-called

owners have committed no crime against property. The statement of the fact is sufficient to show the inequality of the whole system under which the fruits of the earth are kept in the possession of the few. These despised and outcast ones have violated no law of justice or conscience, have committed no unrighteous assault on property. The plain fact that will one day stand clearly forth to explain the whole brutal code which is used to imprison and enslave—the plain reason and object of these laws—is the fact that the rulers who have forcibly seized the earth have made certain rules and regulations to keep possession of the treasures of the world, and when the disinherited have reached out to obtain the means of life, they have been met with these arbitrary rules and lodged in jail.”

“Nearly every crime could be wiped away in one generation by giving the criminal a chance. The life of a burglar, a thief, of a prostitute, is not a bed of roses. Men and women are only driven to these lives after other means have failed. Theirs are not the simple, natural lives of children, nor of the childhood of the world; but men and women can learn these professions or be bred to them. After other resources are exhausted they will be chosen for the simple reason that life is sweet.”

When we come to look for the positive side we find that much is lacking. There is keen analysis of existing conditions and merciless denunciation of present evils, but there is little in the way of any positive method of action. While class rule is clearly seen, there is more of a tendency to appeal to these rulers than to call upon the oppressed to act upon their own initiative. Although the utilitarian basis of ethics is definitely adopted at the beginning, and the idea of innate evil on the side of the criminal is mercilessly ridiculed and denounced, we hear him saying “that the real motive that causes the punishment of crime is malice and hatred and nothing else.” There is almost a complete lack of the historical point of view. Almost the only exception to this being in the discussion of the origin of human slavery: “In its more primitive stages slavery was enforced by the ownership of the man. In its later and more refined stages it is carried on by the ownership of the things from which man must live. All life comes primarily from the earth, and without access to this great first source of being, man must die. Passing from the ownership of individuals, rulers have found it more certain and easier to own the earth, for to own the earth is to fix the terms on which all must live. More and more does the master seek to control access to land, to coal, to timber, to iron, to water—these prime requisites to life. More and more certainly, as time and civilization move on, do these prime necessities pass to the few. Every new engine of production makes it easier for the few to reduce the earth to their possession. * * * From the private ownership of men, the rulers have passed to the private ownership of the earth and the control of the land. The rulers no longer have the right to buy and sell the man, to send him here and there to suit their will. They simply have the power to dictate the terms upon which he can stand upon the earth. With the mines, the forests, the oil, the harbors, the railroads, and the really valuable productive land in the rulers’ hands, the dominance and power of man over his fellows is

absolute and complete. It is not necessary to show that it is the ruling class who own the earth—the owners of the earth must be the ruling class.”

On the question of what we are to do about all this little is said. There is a hint here and there that the political authoritarian state may not be the only form of collective action, but on the whole it is one of the works that is destined to clear the way for constructive action. As such it has few equals in the English language.

William Morris, Poet, Craftsman, Socialist. By Elizabeth Luther Cary.

G. P. Putman's Sons. Cloth, gold stamping, 296 pp.; price \$3.50.

As the years pass by and the things for which he stood come to occupy a greater and greater place in the life of the world, the figure of William Morris grows larger and larger and attracts more and more the attention of critics. The present volume is one which all admirers of the man or his work will value. In binding, typography and general mechanical make-up it is all that could be expected in this commercial age. The illustrations, giving portraits of Morris, Rossetti, Burne-Jones, and the designs for wall paper, furniture, carpets, etc., designed by Morris, are particularly worthy of attention.

The boyhood of Morris was spent in the neighborhood of Epping Forest, in the County of Essex. “The County of Essex was well adapted to feed the prodigious appetite for antiquities. Its churches, in numbers of which Norman masonry is to be found, its ancient brasses, and its tapestry-hung houses, all stimulated his inborn love of the Middle Ages and started him fairly on that path which he followed deviously as long as he lived.”

“At an early age, when Scott was scouring his native heath in search of Border ballads and antiquities, this almost equally precocious boy was collecting rubbings from ancient inscriptions, and picturing to himself, as he wandered about the region of his home on foot or on horseback, the lovely face of England as it looked in the thirteenth or fourteenth century.” Nevertheless it is doubtful if Morris really was so much a product of the middle ages as the writer would have us believe.

He had really seen that a revival of those times was impossible. Numerous passages in his work could be quoted to show that he is not deserving of the epithet of reactionary that is so frequently thrown at him.

His life at Oxford with Burne Jones is sketched at considerable length. Here he was one of the editors of the “Oxford and Cambridge Magazine,” and finally left college with the determination to become an architect. Falling in with Rossetti he spent some time in the study of the technical side of painting, and then followed the construction and decoration of the famous “Red House.” Out of this grew the famous firm of decorators of which Morris was the head and which was destined to revolutionize the art ideas of two continents.

In this direction one can but marvel at the remarkable amount of work which he accomplished. He turned to everything that called for artistic craftsmanship, and in all of these he excelled all his contemporaries. In view of the diversity of the things at which he

worked one does not wonder that many people have been led to doubt his competence in some of these many lines.

Still, we are somewhat surprised to read in a review of this very book, in the New York "Independent," that "Morris was the foremost dilettante of the nineteenth century." Perhaps one reason for this is that his principal followers have been such pronounced dilettanti. Every faddist who desired to while away idle moments with tools, who had "ideas" on art or decoration, has attempted to declare himself a follower of Morris. Even in relation to his Socialism he has been continuously connected with Fabianism and middle-class reformers, who, while he lived, were his special abhorrence. For if there ever was a man who was a true going revolutionist, in Socialism as well as in art and every other field, that man was Morris. Hence the statement of the present writer that Morris did not understand Socialism is grotesque and serves only to show the absolute ignorance of the writer. Her ignorance on this point is proven by the fact that she considered it necessary to explain that Morris did not consider himself bound to divide his wealth with the poor in order to show himself a consistent Socialist. (PP. 162-3.) Aside from this the writer's treatment of Morris' Socialism is fairly good.

Taking the book as a whole, it is a splendid contribution of our knowledge of Morris and is one which every Socialist will love to own and study.

Books Received, to Be Reviewed Later.

The Spirit of the Ghetto. By B. Hutchins Hapgood. Funk & Wagnals Co. \$1.35.

Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolution. By P. Kropotkin. McClure, Phillips & Co. \$2.00.

Economic Tangles. By Judson Grenell. Purdy Publishing Co. \$1.00.

The Coming City. By R. T. Ely. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 60 cents.

The Conquest. By Eva Emery Dye. A. C. McClurg & Co. \$1.50.

A Daughter of the Snows. By Jack London. J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.50.

Swords and Plowshares. By Ernest Crosby. Funk & Wagnalls. \$1.00.

History of the French Revolution. By C. L. James. Abe Isaak, Jr., \$1.00.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A Practical Propaganda Book.

There are two classes of Socialist books, equally necessary and valuable. One is addressed to thinking people who have done some serious reading and are prepared to give some mental effort to the tremendous problems with which the twentieth century has to deal. The other class of books takes the conclusions of Socialist thinkers and restates them in a way to invite and, if possible, compel the attention of unthinking readers, of the wage-slaves who have till now been kept ignorant of the fact of their slavery.

To this latter class belongs the new book, "Capital and Labor," by "A Black-Listed Machinist."

It is not a work that will bring many ideas to the regular readers of The International Socialist Review. The author would be the last to make any such claim for it.

What it does accomplish is to state the Socialist position in a way that will attract and not repel the average trade unionist. We know of no other book on Socialism that the average union workingman would be quite so likely to buy if put in front of him, or to read after buying it, or to act on after reading it.

The book contains 203 pages, and is divided into fifty-five short chapters. We give a few of the titles at random: Genius and Profit, Nothing Succeeds Like Success, Depew's Prosperity, Victims of Trusts, the Capitalist and His Specific, Democracy Exposed, Our Manifest Destiny, What Is Labor's Share? Benevolent Philanthropists, Experience Teaches, the Union Label, Profit Regardless of Results, Wage System and Slavery, An Invitation, What Can I Do for the Cause?

Mechanically, the book is like the paper edition of Vandervelde's "Collectivism," with a special cover design printed in three colors, and showing the party emblem enlarged. The price of the book is 25 cents, while our stockholders can get it at 13 cents by mail or 10 cents by express.

Any local with a few active workers can at once make Socialists and help out its campaign fund by pushing the sale of this book. Now is the time to send for a few copies and try it.

MR. DARROW'S "RESIST NOT EVIL."

This is a book which distinctly belongs to the other of the two classes mentioned at the beginning of this department. Clarence S. Darrow stands in the front rank of the legal profession in Chicago;

in fact, it would be no easy task to name his superior. He understands Socialism better by far than most of the Socialists, and while he has not yet formally joined the Socialist party, it is a pretty safe prediction that the logic of events will bring him to us before many months have passed.

His new book is a relentless indictment of our present capitalist government, particularly as to its methods of dealing with those whom it calls criminals. He shows with clear, keen logic that leaves no escape, the fact that the capitalist state as it exists to-day is neither more nor less than a machine for maintaining the supremacy of the parasitic class which holds paper titles to the wealth produced by the laborers.

Every Socialist will find this a stimulating book to read. Moreover, it has a propaganda value, although of a different sort from "Capital and Labor." Many brain workers who are well informed on general topics, and would readily see the force of Socialist arguments, if their attention could once be arrested, are repelled by the usual style of Socialist argument, which must of necessity be framed in a way to reach the manual laborers, on whose votes the Socialist movement must mainly depend. These brain workers will be quick to see the force of the unanswerable arguments urged by Mr. Darrow, and once they have begun to realize the rottenness of the whole social fabric as it exists to-day, they will be ready and willing to read more.

We therefore advise every Socialist to read "Resist Not Evil," and then lend it to some intellectual proletarian who is not a Socialist.

The book is well printed on heavy laid paper, in invitingly large type, and handsomely bound in cloth, with a unique cover design. Price, including postage, 75 cents.

Mrs. Maynard's Introduction to Whitman.

"Walt Whitman, the Poet of the Wider Selfhood," by Mila Tupper Maynard, is winning general recognition as the best introduction to the study of America's most characteristic poet. We have room for but one quotation this month; it shall be from Horace Traubel, the closest friend of Whitman in his last years, and the one writer generally recognized as Whitman's interpreter. In the last number of his magazine, "The Conservator," Mr. Traubel says:

Whitman may be criticized. But he should not be apologized for. Whitman is often written about by people who are more afraid than convinced. They give with one hand and take back with the other. For instance, there is Salter's Good and Bad Side of Walt Whitman. After all that is so completely offered is just as completely withdrawn you wonder why Salter discussed Whitman at all. For the result was a cipher. And any discussion that yields only a cipher is useless. There are writers who think themselves friends of Whitman who let us dare not wait upon we would. Now, Mila Maynard's fortitude is not skim milk. What she says about Whitman seems obvious enough. Yet the obvious things are often hardest to say. It is right for you if you feel that way inclined to jump on Whitman and show him up. It

never hurts Whitman to be shown up, by enemy or friend. There is nothing objectionable in criticism. But apology is a knife in the back. An apology for an author is an attempt, perhaps unconscious, to murder him. In the text of Mila Maynard's book there is not one word of insulting toleration. She is not idolatrous. She is simply rational and fervent. She has really produced an able compend. *Leaves of Grass* could easily be studied in schools through this brief. It creates no prejudice for or against Whitman. It presents the case in a simple way, relieved of all speciousness of phrase and matter. I have every sort of confidence in Whitman. But I am willing for the sake of Whitman to have Whitman suspected. For Whitman is never so strong as when he just issues from a fight. Mila Tupper goes particularly long in the particularly short chapter on *The Larger Woman*. Whitman used to say to me: "The women should easily understand me." Mila Tupper is that kind of woman. Her Whitman is a gateway to Whitman as Whitman himself is a gateway to the eternal.

The book is artistically printed and bound, and the price, including postage, is one dollar.

The Social Revolution, by Karl Kautsky.

This book is one which is at once a propaganda and an educational work. It clears up more questions and throws light on more disputed points than any work that has been issued for several years. It shows clearly the distinction between reform and revolution and points out the hopelessness of expecting a gradual and imperceptible transition from Capitalism to Socialism.

In the second part, entitled "The Day After the Social Revolution," we have what is perhaps the best short sketch of the transition period and the next social stage that has ever been written. Among the questions discussed under this head are artistic and intellectual production, the savings of co-operative organization, the relative fields of State, municipal and co-operative production and the psychological conditions essential to proletarian domination.

The book has already been translated into French, an English translation is appearing in London "Justice," and it has been welcomed by Socialists all over the world as a work of great importance. In the translation which has just been made by A. M. and May Wood Wimons every effort has been made to make the work clearly intelligible to those who are not familiar with economic terms. It is printed in good, large type and bound in the Standard Socialist Series, and sells for 50 cents, cloth.

Official Party Emblem Buttons.

The official emblem adopted by referendum of the Socialist party some months ago is a pair of clasped hands over a globe, surrounded by the words: "Socialist Party: Workers of the World, Unite!" There have been several emblems designed in accordance with this vote, all of which have been more or less unsatisfactory, especially so

for the reason that the words "Socialist Party" have been so obscurely printed as to defeat the main purpose of wearing a party button, namely, to impress casual observers with the number of active Socialists scattered through any given community.

We have now contracted with a large manufacturing house for a supply of party emblems from an entirely new design, with a red background and with the lettering in white instead of black, and with the party name larger in proportion than in any other official emblem button on the market. The button also carries the union label. Price 5 cents each, 25 cents a dozen, \$1.75 a hundred postpaid, \$12.50 a thousand by express.

Propaganda Leaflets and Booklets.

Two new numbers of the Madden Library are now ready. "Let's All Get Rich," by J. T. McDill, is one of the best all-round propaganda booklets for either city or country that has appeared for many a day. Mr. McDill was one of the most entertaining writers on the old Coming Nation issued by the Ruskin colony, and he is now making straight scientific Socialism into as easy reading as his "Colony Notes" used to be. "By the Throat: the Trusts Have Seized the Farmer," by William R. Fox, is an admirable little book to start the farmers thinking. There are now six numbers of the Madden Library. A sample set will be mailed for 10 cents.

"Compensation," by A. M. Simons, is the latest addition to the series of four-page leaflets which we publish at the nominal price of 50 cents a thousand by mail or 25 cents a thousand by express. Other leaflets at the same price are "Labor Politics," by A. M. Simons, and "Who Are the Socialists?" "Socialism Defined by Socialists," and "Why Join the Socialist Party," by Charles H. Kerr.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,

56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.




THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

FEBRUARY, 1903.

NO. 8.

Socialism Versus Fads.

 LACK of what Whewell so aptly calls "the habit of geometrical thought" is noticeable in much of the confusion which upsets men's judgment of Socialism. Many persons, earnest in their work for the co-operative commonwealth, have only one measure for all problems. From their iron prejudices they forge a Procrustean bed upon which they stretch every event too small to fit it and foreshorten every long-limbed fact which has the misfortune to stick over its rigid limits. Thus, as Locke has observed, "some men have so used their heads to mathematical figures, that in giving a preference to the methods of that science, they introduce lines and diagrams into their study of divinity or political inquiries, as if nothing could be known without them; and others accustomed to retired speculations run natural philosophy into metaphysical notions and the abstract generalities of logic; and how often may one meet with religion and morality treated of in the terms of the laboratory, and thought to be improved by the methods and notions of chemistry?"*

Evidences of the effect of this method abound in every age. Thales of Miletus, the founder of Greek philosophy, based his teachings of Nature on the theory that out of water all things are made. Water is the primal matter and the earth itself floats upon water. The great Philo of Alexandria taught, after the manner of Plato, that the stars are persons endowed with reason and akin to the Divinity. The early churchmen took the Bible as the sole measure of scientific truth and, in consequence, fell into the most childish errors. Many of them denied the sphericity of the earth and the existence of the antipodes. The learned St. Augustine declared that no men live on the other side of the earth because "Scripture speaks of no such descendants of Adam."

* Conduct of the Understanding, sec. 24.

Martin Luther bitterly assailed the heliocentric theory of Copernicus and asserted that "this fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth."* When Newton advanced the doctrine of the unequal refrangibility of different rays to account for colors, Goethe wrote his *Farbenlehre* (Tübingen, 1810), in fierce opposition to the doctrine. He held up Newton to the world as a scientific impostor, and propounded the utterly absurd hypothesis of "the dim medium." Both his training in Natural History and his poetic turn of mind operated to unfit him for the tasks imposed by the mechanical sciences and, in the words of Tyndal, "he became a mere *ignis fatuus* to those who followed him."** We know that it took the geologists one hundred years to prove that fossils are organic. Voltaire*** ridiculed Bernard Palissy, Moro, and Vallisneri and argued that fossils are mere sports of nature due to the plastic power of the earth itself. And it required almost one hundred and fifty years to prove that fossils are not to be referred to the Noachian deluge.

Indeed, almost every new science has to suffer from its function and limitation warping and misconceiving from within and without. The science of economics has not escaped a like experience. Some men take it out of the realm of the practical and the material and set it up as the standard to which all knowledge and faith must conform or suffer rejection. In its name they damn all creeds and dogmas. As part of what they consider the legitimate philosophy of Socialism they deny the spirituality of mind and the existence of an unseen world, or affirm the necessity of vegetarianism and the Suchness of the Mahâyâna. Anti-vaccination, absent treatment, vitaopathy, Buddhism, osteopathy, faith-cure, total abstinence, free love, self-hypnotic healing, personal vibration, breakfast foods, atheism, naturopathic regeneration, astrology, or drugless medication—as the case may be—are offered us in virtue of, and by logical inclusion with, the Socialism of the man who has only one measure for all things.

I remember, a little over a year ago, with what amazement I listened to a lecturer on Socialism who, with evident relish, quoted this sentence from Dr. Paul Carus: "The essential feature of existence, of that which presents itself to the senses, is not the material, but the formal; not that which makes it concrete and particular, but that which constitutes its nature and applies generally; not that which happens to be here, so that it is this, but that

* Andrew D. White; *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, vol. I., ch. III., p. 126. New York, 1901.

** *Fragments of Science*, vol. II., ch. IX., p. 148. New York, 1897.

*** *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Voltaire*, Paris, Sanson et Cie., 1782, vol. 48, p. 131 et seq.

which makes it to be thus; not its Thisness but its Suchness."* The discourse itself was vaguely soothing, like James Jeffrey Roche's Concord love-song:

"Ah, the Ifness sadd'ning,
The Whichness madd'ning,
And the But ungladd'ning
That lie behind!

When the signless token
Of love is broken
In the speech unspoken
Of mind to mind!"

But imagine the flood of pure white light which such a discourse poured into the brains of the non-Socialists of that audience! At the worst, however, it was Socialism only in the Pickwickian sense and did not roughly antagonize any one's private beliefs. The lecturer was deeply interested in things occult and could not resist the opportunity, which an audience gathered to hear of Socialism gave him, to expound his favorite doctrines concerning the Nirvâna.

On the other hand one frequently meets with the man who prefaces his explanation of Socialism by insisting, like Büchner in matters of science, that the mind must first be emptied of all ideas of God and the supernatural before it is in a proper condition to receive the philosophy of Karl Marx. He wanders far afield to attack this church or that dogma and leaves his hearer under the impression that Socialism is essentially atheistic. He blames all the misery and ignorance in the world upon religion and seems never to have learned that a materialist conception of history puts beyond doubt the fact that the social organism is, in a very large measure, conditioned by its interaction with industrial environment, and that a comparative study of religions shows the influence of economic factors in much of their development. Such a man does positive harm to the cause of Socialism; and he is just as unreasonable and as unscientific as the preacher who insists on basing the science of economics upon his own particular creed.

There is, furthermore, the utterly inconsistent fad of "Christian Socialism," whose upholders put forth the dogma of the Fatherhood of God as the ground-work of economic science and then proceed to build upon it a superstructure as much out of plumb as the leaning tower of Pisa. They contend that Labor and Capital must recognize their mutual rights,—that, in other

* Preface to *Acvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, p. vii. Chicago, 1900.

words, the lamb must lie down in the lion's belly and rely upon its coat of wool to protect itself from the searching acid of the gastric juices thereof. They would have men led into the highways of industrial righteousness by the allurements of Gospel texts, unmindful of the fact that nineteen centuries of such blandishment have failed to soften the granite heart of the ruling classes. The New Testament was never designed to serve as a treatise on Socialism any more than it was intended to teach the first principles of Biology. With profound reverence for its beautiful pages, I find it vastly inferior to Huxley and Martin's "Practical Biology" and Karl Marx's "Das Kapital," for the same reason that I find Homer's "Iliad" inferior to Remsen's "Chemistry," for when I want to study either of these sciences I can discover no knowledge of the protoplasm in St. Matthew and no guides to quantitative analysis in Homer. This fact, however, does not hinder me from giving full value to the letters of St. Paul nor from appreciating the rhythm and swing of the lines that carry that ancient swashbuckler Achilles.

But when the crazy charge of infidelity is urged against us and a bishop forces a Father McGrady to resign because of his advocacy of Socialism, we may rightly say with Thoreau: "Really, there is no infidelity, nowadays, so great as that which prays, and keeps the Sabbath, and rebuilds the churches." Surely, it is a flagrant infidelity which denies all Truth which does not bear the approval of a bishop's *imprimatur*. It is a subtle atheism which admits the existence of God and then in His Name refuses economic salvation to millions of His creatures; which prays to Heaven and builds churches for worship and then tacitly sanctions the Capitalism which burns the marrow out of orphans' bones.

One is tempted to borrow from Mary MacLean's litany and exclaim: "From such 'Christian Socialism' kind devil deliver us!" The name is misleading. We do not speak of Christian astronomy nor of Christian geology for the obvious reason that these sciences are concerned about a different order of things than that of Christianity. They lie outside the domain of the spiritual just as much as Socialism does. Men of judgment would be quick to condemn the chemist who might claim finality of criticism upon a painting of Leonardo da Vinci from an analysis of the oils and pigments used in the famous study of "The Last Supper." They would, indeed, concede the results of his analysis, but only in so far as the limits of chemistry go, and not as against the verdict of a Ruskin or a Mrs. Jameson. In like manner we are justified in rejecting the Church's criticism of Socialism to the same extent that scientists refused to accept the condemnation of Galileo by the Holy Roman Inquisition, of Copernicus by Luther, and of

Prof. Winchell by the Methodist Episcopal authorities of the Vanderbilt University in Tennessee.

Socialism must be maintained within the well-defined lines of economic science. It is broad enough for men of all thought, but it is altogether too big for sectarian prejudice, bigotry and fads. The genuine Socialist looks from the heights upon such things and has long ago learned that the largest tolerance is to be tolerant of intolerance, because his philosophy gives him a perspective wide enough in its sweep to gauge the relativity of such affairs. Although both words are philologically of the same blood, there is a vast difference between "patience" and "passion." Patience is the well-regulated persistence of the scientist in search of knowledge, whereas passion stumbles with the blindness of the enthusiast, of the man with only one measure for all problems, who twists and warps them to fit his Procrustean bed. It is incumbent upon the scientist to be patient in his work and to lock out the confusion of fads from the precious laboratory of Socialism.

Thos. J. Hagerty.

A Patent Medicine for Trusts.



WHILE I am writing these lines, Congress is buried under a veritable flood of anti-trust bills. The dominant tendency is in favor of a frank recognition of the fact that the trusts have come to stay and that they must be placed under public control. This is certainly a vindication of the Socialist position, though our statesmen and economists are, not unnaturally, loath to admit the fact. "Competition" is still the word. The policy in relation to trusts should be "one which welcomes centralization, but represses monopoly," says Prof. John Bates Clark, of Columbia University, unwittingly paraphrasing Mr. Dooley.

That under free competition the wage-worker, the capitalist and the landlord draw each his equitable share in the joint product of labor, capital and land, none but the benighted Marxists will deny, after the publication of Prof. Clark's "Distribution of Wealth." If everyone gets his dues, there is no exploitation of labor by capital. "There is no pain," as the Christian Scientist said to Mark Twain, and society is saved.

We have chosen Prof. Clark for our text advisedly, for he is looked up to by his craftsmen as the foremost leader of economic thought in America. Now, that competition is on trial, he has ventured out before a larger audience with "an argument in favor of curbing the trusts by a natural method,"* which has evidently inspired our solons who are now devising ways and means to remedy the evils of the trusts. A talk with so eminent an authority will therefore be both timely and instructive.

Of course, Prof. Clark would not "try the experiment of State Socialism." Says he:

"There is no doubt that the growth of trusts has caused State Socialism to present itself to many a mind as a possible alternative for a regime of monopoly; and if it were the only alternative, the case for it would be a strong one. As between a system of unregulated monopolies in private hands and one great public monopoly, many a man will prefer the latter. The situation, however, is not so serious. The trust is not now unregulated, and is by no means incapable of further regulations." (pp. 54-55.)

Prof. Clark's plan of regulation would protect "the public," i. e., the consumers, by aiding the independent manufacturer, because his interests are at bottom identical with those of the con-

* The Control of Trusts.

An argument in favor of curbing the power of monopoly by a natural method. By John Bates Clark.

sumer, though the latter may derive a temporary benefit from a reduction of the price below the normal level, yet as soon as competition is crushed he is made to pay the cost of war. The public, as consumers, have therefore a vital interest in maintaining competition. This policy, if adopted, is bright with the promise of a happier day. "You will see workers acquiring capital, while still earning wages in the mill; and, as an outcome not so remote as a Philistine view would make it, you may see production moving so steadily that the bonds of great corporations, and even the stocks, may become common and safe forms of investment of workmen's savings. You will see them used so freely for this purpose that the old and sharp line of demarcation between the capitalist class and the laboring class will be blurred and at many points obliterated. The men who work will have a proprietary interest in the tools of labor and a share in what the tools produce. The Socialist is not the only man who can have beatific visions, for the picture of a manly development for the laborer—of a perpetual rise in wages and increase in savings, in home owning, in personal independence, and in culture—is presented to everyone who sees what competition is capable of doing." (pp. 10-11.)

Suppose, however, the hydra of monopoly should somehow manage to escape the doom to which it is consigned by Prof. Clark and our legislators now deliberating at Washington? What then? "Monopoly is unendurable," he says. "If we cannot exterminate it or reduce it to harmless dimensions, we shall begin even to listen to the seductions of the Socialists. . . . Momentous beyond the power of language to measure is the question whether centralization may be allowed to go to utmost lengths without fastening on the people the intolerable burden of monopoly. Answer this question in one way, and you will probably be a Socialist; and certainly you ought to be one." (pp. 8-9.)

At this juncture the wicked heart of the Socialist is moved by the feeling Mephistopheles must have had when trying to lead good old Dr. Faust into temptation. We shall show our own doctor his scheme in operation, assuming without argument that the law could be so framed as to escape the Scylla of "class legislation" and the Charybdis of "unconstitutionality."

Prof. Clark would not "prescribe by law the prices at which goods must be sold." Many are "the difficulties encountered by such a policy."

"It would require commissions containing many members, all wise and incorruptible. It would require superhuman skill in devising and applying a scientific rule for adjusting prices. Granting that commissions having such impossible qualities could be secured and that their action could be made effective, the result

would have to resolve itself into a regulation of profits. The only basis on which prices could be prescribed would be one of cost. We should wish to leave the producer a return that would pay fair wages, managers' salaries, interest on capital and insurance against risks. We should make the price, in short, cover cost of production, as liberally and scientifically interpreted." (p. 53.)

Such a task is thought impossible of accomplishment, whereas "competition itself tends to make prices conform to the standard" (p. 53), "so long as competition is kept alive" (p. 58). The remedy suggested is to "make the local cutting of prices, the breaking of a scale of prices for a predatory end and the factors' agreement illegal and punishable, and to *do what you can to secure the execution of the law*" (p. 77).

Prof. Clark is fully aware of the fact that while "these unfair acts could all be defined and forbidden," yet "not many laws are more difficult of enforcement than these would be" (p. 66). Some of the methods which might be successfully resorted to in order to evade the law are discussed at length by the author himself, and the reader need only be referred to the respective portions of the book.* Still he maintains that the difficulties are not insurmountable and the law could be enforced.

"The thing to be done is to discover what is a monopoly. . . . At present there rests upon the courts the duty of determining in what cases a monopoly actually exists; and the determination has its difficulties. . . . The test of the question whether the great corporation is or is not a true monopoly is applied by determining whether the way is or is not open for the competitor to appear. . . . Can the rival safely appear or can he not? is the test question in the case. . . . The typical act that identifies the unlawful power is the crushing of rivals by the means above described. . . . What is needed is to make each one of the practices by which competitors are terrorized legal evidence of the existence of a monopolistic power and to condemn, under the common law, any corporation that shall afford this evidence" (pp. 70-79).

"If it could be proved that a reduction in the price of some one type of goods was not justified by changes in the conditions of production, this would be an evidence that the cut was made for a predatory purpose. If the price of the particular grade of goods were first put down and then put up again, and if rivals were crushed in the interval, this would be evidence that the purpose of the cut was illegitimate. Sharp enough penalties for such conduct, enforced in a few cases, might make the policy too dangerous to be practiced. It is not to be admitted that statutes for the

* Pp. 13-15, 34, 35, 66-68, 70, 71.

suppression of wars of extermination, such as a trust can now wage against its rivals, are powerless. They are, to be sure, difficult of enforcement; but if the people were living always in a heroic mood and maintaining a fierce watchfulness over their officers, the thing desired would certainly be done, and it may be done in any case." (p. 69.)

It is one of the shortcomings of American university specialization that our economists are not lawyers and our lawyers are not economists. An illustration is afforded by the passage, quoted above, where the author, doubtful of the power of statutes to resist the skill of the technical lawyer, would rather rely upon the "common law" to condemn any monopolistic corporation, upon proof of practices which must yet be made "legal evidence" of monopoly. How are they to be made "legal evidence," if not by statute? The common law does not prohibit the merchant from selling below cost with the intent to drive out a competitor. So we are left after all to the protection of the statutes. Now let us assume that the people *are* "living in a heroic mood;" their officers, under a representative form of government, would naturally be chosen from among those living in the same heroic mood, which would materially facilitate the task of "maintaining a fierce watchfulness" over them. Amidst a people living in a heroic mood the reputable lawyer would not dream of "gauging his skill by his success in driving a coach and four through the statutes." In the humble opinion of the present writer, however—and he will doubtless be borne out by every member of the legal fraternity—the technical lawyer would have no occasion for the display of his skill, in order to secure immunity for the monopolist under the law suggested by Prof. Clark.

Let us suppose a case where a great combination has been indicted for having created a monopoly. One of the tests that the economist would have the court apply is, "Can the rival safely appear or can he not?" By what legal evidence could this be determined? Would the prosecution be allowed to call witnesses to testify that they would like very much to build competitive mills, but were afraid? Under what rules of evidence would such testimony be admissible? Or would experts be asked the "hypothetical question," whether, in their opinion, "the way is or is *not* open for the competitor to appear?" To answer it would require a degree of clairvoyance uncommon even among "handwriting experts." It is safe to predict that so long as the principle holds good in American jurisprudence, that the accused is entitled to the benefit of the doubt, there could be no conviction upon such testimony, assuming it had been admitted by a judge "living in a heroic mood."

It is impossible to obtain a conviction in a court of justice

upon mere proof that "the rival mill is terrorized in advance and precluded from appearing" (p. 72). Modern criminal law does not condemn for mere evil intent without some overt act. To convict a corporation of creating a monopoly, evidence would be required of the crushing of actual rivals, not of merely "potential competitors." The proof, as we know, would have to show "that the reduction in the price of some one type of goods was not justified by changes in the conditions of production."

It would require the appointment of a referee to examine the conditions of production of a number of different grades of goods manufactured by the same corporation; the inquiry would have to embrace all elements of cost, viz.: wages, salaries, interest, insurance, etc. Where a corporation largely utilizes by-products, "it would require skill in devising and applying a scientific rule" for apportioning the total cost of production among a score of products turned out by the same works. There is reason to believe that there would be wide difference of opinion as to what is the correct "scientific rule." Aside from purely technical questions, involving many problems in mining, engineering, chemistry, railroading, etc., there would, probably, be occasion for expert testimony upon the theory of value; the classical school, the historical school, the Austrians, would all have an opportunity to have their views passed upon by the learned referee.

Nor is that all. "If the price of the particular grade of goods were first put down and then put up again, and if rivals were crushed in the interval, that would be evidence that the cut was illegitimate." It is, certainly, not to be assumed that the mere testimony of an unsuccessful competitor would be accepted as conclusive evidence against a corporation on trial, since his retirement might prove to have been due to his own improvidence or lack of business ability. So, the case would further involve an extended examination of the causes of many failures in business, and all that on a national scale, requiring the appointment of commissioners to take testimony, perhaps, in a dozen of States.

It must be left to the imagination of a lawyer to conjecture how many sessions before the referee would be required and how many volumes of testimony he would have to consider, before he were ready to submit his report to the court. If it ordinarily takes a few years to carry a corporation case "through the mill," how long would a case of so complicated a nature drag along in the courts? However Draconic the penalties, the possibility of their infliction would be too remote to inspire terror to the "predatory" trusts.

The proceeding would practically throw upon the court the duty "to prescribe the prices at which goods ought to have been sold,"—*nunc pro tunc*. None of the difficulties encountered by

an attempt to prescribe prices by law would be obviated. Instead of "a commission containing many members, all wise and incorruptible," there would be the referee, who would have to be a man of encyclopedical learning, and 'above him would be the judges of the courts of general jurisdiction, learned in the law, to be sure, but laying no claims at omniscience.

Instead of confining itself to cost of materials, wear and tear of machinery, salaries, wages, etc., and the state of supply and demand—which would be the work of a commission appointed to adjust prices—the court would have before it the additional task of inquiring into business accounts of private corporations and long past sins of commission and omission of their managers and agents. The first case tried in court would convince public opinion of the utter inefficiency of such a statute.

From all of which it is evident that Prof. Clark's remedy "cannot exterminate monopoly or reduce it to harmless dimensions." If so, he said, he would begin even to listen to our seductions. Satisfied that centralization goes hand in hand with monopoly, he *will probably be a Socialist*; certainly he *ought to be one*. These are his own words. *Marxist.*

The Unity of Life.



WASHINGTON, Ind., Nov. 19.—Two hundred and fifty men, employed in the coal mines here, struck to-day because they claimed the operators had failed to have the bank mules properly fed and curried."—Chicago Inter Ocean.

What is the deep and hidden spring in human nature this incident discloses? What is the moving spirit, the struggling impulsion that sets the need of the brute creature above the immediate "interest" of the toiling human?

Among the many indications that humanity is rising above the sordid standard of gain of material possessions as the chief aim and purpose of existence, this act of these miners is of striking import, and a brilliant expression of the majesty of that quality in man for which we have no other term than "divine." It is a disclosure of the innate sense of justice in man, and that it is co-operating with Infinite Intelligence, Universal Mind.

This omnipresent potency has in painful slowness wrought through the centuries to awaken in man the slumbering perceptions and potencies of his being that can alone accomplish his deliverance from the tyranny of the master, and oppressive environment, and lift him to the intelligence and freedom of a fully equipped manhood. The conception of a Deity, a Divine personality, that requires slavish submission to a master, is quite put in the shade by such an expression of unselfishness and love of justice as the miners exhibited in striking for the benefit of the dumb beast of burden.

Many years ago I heard Wendell Phillips say: "Altruism is only wise selfishness." But only after centuries of different forms of slavery has human ignorance been sufficiently illuminated to discover this basic truth of human association, that the interest of each is the interest of all and the interest of all the interest of each.

The poet discerned that we are "bound in the bundle of the race." The man who digs and delves in the "land of the noonday night" is quickened by the perception in his inmost self, (tho' it may be unconsciously,) that *all life is one and* ALL SERVICE SACRED.

The master, whether of the chattel slave of the past or the wage slave of the present, is benumbed in his higher nature by willingness to accept the enforced service and necessity of a fellow being. In failing to recognize the solidarity of all life and all human beings, and in promoting an uneducated submissive toil-

ing class, the master employer and captain of industry is lowering his own status as a man.

The scholar and the gentleman of the old time and the new, who willingly, without compensation, lives off the profit of the toil of another, cannot compare in human grandeur with these miners, however unschooled or uncultured, who set aside their immediate interests in protest of injustice to the working beast.

The tap of Socialism is *justice*. This vital, germinal principle, inherent in human nature and cosmic law, involves also the energizing, cementing quality of love.

Therefore, Socialism making of one family all the people, will prepare and provide the conditions whereby the child, the infirm, all the class whose limitations exceed their capacity will be, not pauperized, but cared for as brothers and sisters.

Nature's provision in the planet is ample for all the needs of the physical man. Man's equal opportunity to achieve subsistence is the primary demand of social economics, as it is the primary element of justice. The mighty and beneficent work of Socialism is to restore to humanity the birthright of equal opportunity, which means equal access to nature's resources.

Man to be free, and to glorify manhood, must joy in his work, his capacity to create, to produce. The real noble man or noble woman is the man or woman who ennobles work by enjoying the accomplishment of the best possible product, and the social state which alone can secure peace, happiness and prosperity to each and all, can only be the state in which the producer can enjoy the products of his labor.

Capitalism is robbery. Wage working is slavery. The profit making of the capitalist system destroys the nobility of manhood, by making a beast of prey of the capitalist and his operating agents, and even destroys helpless child life.

Human language is inadequate to paint the hideous monster, profit making. That man in the form and semblance of human beings can deliberately enslave the helpless child, doom the tender, immature forms to long hours of wearisome tending of machines, working in breakers, or any protracted monotonous toil, is so monstrous a crime against childhood that it is difficult to comprehend the moral atrophy of such inhuman specimens of the genus homo.

Come to the rescue of helpless childhood ought to ring in trumpet tones in the mind of every citizen of this land. Come to the rescue of the child, or the liberty and progress of our people will soon be a thing of the past.

Can the child be delivered from the profit-making monster except through the justice and beneficent ordering of Socialism?

Lucinda B. Chandler.

A Question for the Agitator.

AN earnest Socialist, who is devotedly attached to the Socialist Labor party and its problems, was once, in conversation with me, fiercely arraigning all Socialists outside the pale of his party for what appeared to him as the folly of their tactics. He had rehearsed the whole catalogue of the crimes of the "Kangaroos" and the "Debsites," and had expressed the usual opinion that there is but one Socialist party, and De Leon is its prophet, when I interrupted and gently remarked: "My dear Schmutz, the trouble with you is that you lack a sense of humor." The interruption, however, did not have the desired soothing effect. Instead of taking the remark as I meant it—that a sense of humor would enable him to recognize the absurdity of his party's claim to all virtue and wisdom—he thought I was pleading for a gentler warfare against social injustice, and he cried out: "There is no humor in the crimes of capitalism. It is no laughing matter to us poor devils who are shut out from the enjoyment of the good things of life to which we are entitled." Yes, capitalism is a tragedy, but it is beyond the ordinary human capacity to go on forever with one's teeth clenched in the frenzy of combat. There are some austere ones with the iron in their souls who can maintain a fierce front 365 days in the year, and play Peter the Hermit from daylight to darkness, but most of us can't stand the pace. Fierce fire consumes quickly, and sanity demands an occasional cessation in the work of feeding the flames of our indignation.

All that sounds like the introduction to an essay on "The Sweet Virtue of Being Good-Humored," or some such subject, but the thought in my mind was merely to remark that there are in the experiences of all Socialist agitators diverting incidents to relieve the grimness of the campaign against capitalism. For me a rest cure for the exhaustion following a long intellectual strain and tense ethical effort has been provided by dwelling on the delicious naivete of many of the questions put to me by those who have difficulty in imagining anything outside the range of their immediate experience. Real joy comes from thinking of the humor in the request—every agitator has heard it—to construct off-hand in complete detail the Co-operative Commonwealth which is to take the place of the present regime. "How will this, that and the other be done?" innocently asks the inquirer. If he is not given all the detailed information of art and science which only an Admirable Crichton could provide he goes off exulting in his heart over how, with a "practical" question, he has demolished the insubstantial fabric of a crazy dreamer's vision. I do not begrudge him his exultation, for he has made me laugh.

There is also humor, of a grim sort, in another question propounded to the agitator, but it is one that demands an answer. This is, "How are you going to get it?" That is, how are the Socialists to bring about "the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution" now owned by the capitalist class? The agitator working in virgin territory doesn't like to blurt out, "Why, we mean to just take it." That brings the cry, "confiscation," and "confiscation," to one unversed in the ethics of wealth, spells "stealing," and no Socialist agitator enjoys being considered either a present or prospective thief. Of course the confiscation shoe is on the capitalist foot. The capitalist class confiscates the surplus value created by labor, and the working class only means to reclaim its own, but it takes time for that logic to find lodgment in the brains of "the untutored savage," who never heard that the producer of wealth is entitled to his full product. The benighted one has never questioned the divine right of parasitism, and the agitator seeking converts doesn't care to alarm his quarry by turning on the full candle power of the search-light of truth.

Hence it is that this question, "How are you going to get it?" has been one of the most troublesome the agitators, "the boys in the trenches," have had to meet. It may be vaguely replied that we propose doing no man injustice; that we may take over certain properties "with or without compensation," but at best anything short of a complete exposition of our theory of property relations is an unsatisfactory response to the interrogation. I have been surprised, however, to find how completely the capitalists themselves and their apologists are answering this question for us. This answer is provided in the now familiar phrase, "the responsibility of wealth," which rolls so unctuously from the throats of the clerical almoners of the very rich. "The responsibility of wealth" means that the private possession thereof is a trust; that the holders are but stewards for Society; or, as the preposterous Baer puts it, for God. Carnegie has thrown the weight of his authority to the view that the only excuse for private ownership is that wealth shall be administered for the common good. Rockefeller, while he modestly ascribes his holdings not so much to his own sagacity as to God's favor, still admits that he is but a steward. Of course, we do not expect any moral philosophy from cheerful buccaneers like John W. Gates and others of his ilk, but the fact remains that in every quarter where there is any pretension to moral responsibility it is admitted that wealth is not an absolute possession, but a trust.

Prof. Charles Zueblin, of the University of Chicago, indorses this proposition in his lecture on "Ruskin and the Ethics of Wealth," which I heard on the occasion of its recent delivery be-

fore the Woman's Club of Louisville, Ky. In the course of this lecture Prof. Zueblin also takes occasion to indorse the soundness of the democratic principle. At the close of his lecture he called for questions and general discussion, and I submitted this: "If it is a fact that wealth is a social product and must be administered for the social good; and if the democratic principle is sound, are we not compelled to admit the logical soundness of the Socialist demand for a democratic administration of wealth." His answer was affirmative. Indeed, it could not well have been otherwise, and the incident is related only to buttress the contention that in no responsible quarter is it maintained that wealth (capital) is an absolute private possession. Once this is admitted, the whole fabric of private ownership in the wealth-producing machinery falls to the ground. Title deeds to property become mere charters granted by Society—charters whose validity depends upon the good behavior of the holders; charters revocable when the social need makes revocation necessary or desirable.

Society is the unit of civilization, and every institution, before establishing its right to exist, must demonstrate its social utility. Hence private ownership of capital must render an account of its stewardship to Society. Failing to show that with the materials at hand it has provided the largest possible measure of material comfort for its wards, it forfeits its right to administer any longer the wealth in its hands. Fifty years and more ago capitalism was indicted for inefficiency by the Communist Manifesto in these words:

" . . . It becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in Society and to impose its conditions of existence upon Society as an overriding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him instead of being fed by him."

Since this indictment was drawn the evidences of capitalist class inefficiency have multiplied appallingly. There may have been a time when want was unavoidable, but in this day of abounding wealth poverty is an anachronism and a crime. The fact that gaunt misery stalks in the midst of prodigious plenty is an indictment of the capitalists for criminal incapacity in the administration of wealth. They have been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and the toiling millions of the earth are demanding their own—the right to administer that which they have created. Every vestige of warrant for private ownership has disappeared. Civilization can exist without "captains of industry." Labor has attained its majority and no longer needs the watchful care of Trustee Carnegie, Steward Rockefeller or God's Chosen, Baer.

Charles Dobb.

The Church and the Proletarian.

THE problem of the relation of the Church to the working classes is entirely modern, and the reasons why this is so will, it is to be hoped, appear in the course of this article. The word Church is here used of organized Christianity in any form, but particularly of the Protestant Churches, for, as far as the Roman Catholic Church retains a hold upon the working classes it is outside the pale of our consideration, and where it has lost its hold, it is upon the same footing as the other churches, and no better.

Now, it will be generally admitted that the Church has no control over the mass of workingmen, that they do not attend its services, that they ignore its claims, that they find their ethical sanctions outside of religion, and that the teachings of the clergy, except as far as education has caused the members of the working class to retain certain concepts, which, after all are more social than religious in their nature, are inoperative with regard to the great majority of the toiling population. The Church periodicals are full of admissions of these facts, Church congresses discuss them, organizations are attempted to bring into greater harmony the masses and the Christian efforts put forward by the churches, and the alienation of the body of hard workers from the affairs of the Church is the cause of much grief to the sensitive humanitarians among the clergy, who find in the breach between the masses and religion one of the most disheartening facts of modern life.

In order to examine our problem with any chance of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion, we must first understand the present, and, therefore, the historic significance of the terms working classes or proletariat and Church.

The working class as a objective reality is a new class and dates only from about a century and a half ago. It is as modern as the age of machinery. In the Middle Ages artisans followed for the most part some additional occupation, chiefly farming, or if they were specialized were members of guild organizations, and either possessed small capital or expected to do so. They were on terms of social equality with the master—except in few rare instances—married his daughter, and succeeded to the business. They were hence a part of the social structure and the religion which suited the social structure suited them. There was, therefore, no religious question; baron and retainer were part of the same religious system, the religious rite was also a social rite.

In the time mediate between the downfall of the feudal system and our own times, that is the time during which the domestic sys-

tem had developed, the conflict of classes had been fought out on the religious as well as on the political and economic fields, and in those countries where the new system had made headway, the Protestant revolt had fixed the destinies of the hand workers, who still for the most part followed some other occupation as well as their regular trade. The Catholic Church was associated in their minds with the interests of the class for whose overthrow they had fought, and they were thus by inclination Protestants, in England, Protestant Dissenters, and in America members of the so-called "free" Churches.

All this time there had been growing up an independent class, that of the day laborers, and the advent of the machine industry at almost one swoop converted the mass of workers into this class, brought into being the modern working class, and established what has been called the proletariat. Now it will be observed that this class has, according to history, no part in society. It is not and never has been a recognized social factor; it has no fixed station; it never belonged to the guilds. It never took any part except so far as it was compelled to do so in the fight between bourgeois and the feudal lord, and consequently having no part in the social life, has no class interest in the manifestation of religious life representative of social and political interests. So when this class became large enough to be an important factor in national affairs, the Church discovered that it had lost its hold upon it and thus had no control over a progressive and powerful element of society.

In losing its hold upon this class the Church has missed its final opportunity of being a permanent political and social force. The days of the statesmen-bishops are over, the political parson is a thing of the past. The declaration of the temporal power does not excite any enthusiasm in Catholic countries, and the cries of "Il Papa Reé" are only the meaningless utterances of perfervid pilgrims. On the other hand, the power of the parson is gone; his word is no longer of social import; the town-meeting can get along without him; he has lost his position as a social magnate. What power he retains is by virtue of his own personal dignity, of respect for his ethical teachings, of acceptance of his standards of life and conduct.

But the Church persists. In spite of the destruction of its dogmas by science and the loss of political prestige and social weight, it still appears to be sound and healthy. Still the new class, which is to be the victor on the field of economic and political warfare is outside of it, has nothing to do with it, and cannot be persuaded to take it seriously. Ecclesiastical effort, then, represents the efforts of a class other than the working class. What will happen when the working class has the control, when the wealth of the present possessing class is either cut off altogether

or tremendously curtailed? Will the Church thereupon succumb, will Christianity have passed the border which so many anterior creeds have crossed and gone down to their death?

In order to arrive at anything like an approximate view of Church prospects we have to understand the historical significance of ecclesiastical history up to the present. Here there need be no discussion as to the supernatural qualities of the Christian religion, the authenticity of its sacred books, the actual events in the life of its Founder. Here Christianity is simply regarded as a sociological fact.

The Church, it is commonly said, represents a moral force. That is true. The Church is an ethical teacher, but it is a teacher which has never given all its time to the teaching of ethics. It has nearly always been an enormous political and social power. At a very early period of Church history, only a little more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of its Founder, the Church vaulted into the saddle, not as an ethical teacher but as a political power. Constantine elevated it, or degraded it, as you please, into a state religion, the Council of Nice copper-riveted its doctrines; henceforward it was bound up with the destinies of empires that is with the destinies of the ruling classes of empires.

From this time on it was propagated by the civil and military resources of the State. The clergyman was thus practically an officer of state. But if possible still more important was the role which the Church played in education and the learned professions. Philosophy and jurisprudence were parts of the field to whose possession the Church claimed the exclusive right, and hence so tinged were these branches of human activity by ecclesiastical influence that the political revolt had to assume a theological guise; for the minds of the people were, as Engels somewhat harshly says, "stuffed with religion." Even during the course of the Protestant revolution, the diverse interests of sections of the revolutionary party assumed diverse theological clothing; thus there was a moderate party and one more extreme such as the Anabaptists representing a more radical political doctrine as well as a more radical interpretation of scriptures in accordance with that doctrine.

Calvin with his democratization of the Church and its republicanization set a fair pace for the triumph of the bourgeois in religious affairs, and by the infusion of this spirit into the Church of England in opposition to the absolutist theories of the Stuarts and the country gentry, succeeded in creating that institution which the Oxford movement endowed with a new lease of life, but which is now flickering out in mere formalism.

Precisely, as far as the broad marks are considered, the same course of ecclesiastical development is to be noted on the conti-

ment of Europe, where Protestantism in its various forms represented the interests of the trading part of the community, and where the proletariat merely acquiesced in the ecclesiastical forms set up by the economic superiors.

Religion in France, however, entered upon a new phase. The defeat of the Protestants and the consequent revocation of the Edict of Nantes killed all the aspirations of the trading classes for a new religion. They became subjected to a new and that an anti-religious movement, for their interests were represented by the pre-revolutionary philosophers who were atheistic in their tendencies. Hence, the French Revolution marked the entire absence of religion in the consideration of political ideals. Still, the non-religion of the French bourgeois class was just as much a purely class affair as was the Protestantism of the other European countries, and French atheism was as little representative of working class sentiment as was English Protestantism.

But the French atheistic movement had a great, if indirect, influence upon the middle classes of other countries. Henceforward, the middle class was by no means thoroughly religious; in fact, a great and ever-increasing proportion of it became free-thinkers of various shades. The development of modern science has more and more fascinated the middle class intellect, and the last century has witnessed a constant alienation of culture and knowledge from all ecclesiastical effort.

In other words, the Church has lost its force as a political power, and it can no longer hope to wield an influence over the minds of men by virtue of its authority as an arm of the civil power.

The specialization of modern life has also tended to diminish the scope of its influence. Science, philosophy, law and other branches of human activity have become more and more independent of ecclesiastical interference, and the Church is driven closer and closer to the mere work of teaching ethics. The political and other offices thrust upon it since the time of Constantine, the assumption of political and social importance, are rapidly falling away from it, and the occupation of a preacher of righteousness in accordance with the teaching of the Founder appears to be the only duty left to the priest and the minister.

But the Protestant churches hold their own by virtue of certain other distinct functions. They are social clubs for the middle classes. The respectability of a member of society is gauged, more or less, by the standing of the Church to which he belongs; for there are churches fashionable and non-fashionable; churches which are attended solely by a certain class and churches again into which the persons attending the former class never set foot. They are meeting places for the young of both sexes who belong

to a certain station in life, guarantees of social standing and income, marriage bureaus of undoubted respectability, where life partners are chosen, and they provide a certain amount of occupation for the restless and bewildered women of the middle classes, who, having abrogated the essentially feminine functions, are pursued by the demons of social ambition and eternal ennui.

None of these functions appeal to the working classes. The young of that class have their own way of becoming mutually acquainted; they have no social position; they have no fixed income; their women have too much to do in the ordinary round of domestic duties to find time for the mild dissipations of modern Protestantism; and as no provision is made for their ethical training, they receive none except such as the conditions of their life have imposed upon them.

What, then, is the condition of the problem which we set out to consider? We have a church which is shorn of all distinction and power, which rests fundamentally upon its force as a teacher of ethics, and we find that church confronted by a population, not hostile to it, but which does simply not regard it, does not trouble itself about it, and to whom it is more or less of a jest.

In other words, the Church of to-day is confronted by the same problem which it had to face at its first institution. It must go forth simply as the apostle of the religion of Christ, shorn of all power and social dignity, and by virtue of the power of its message win for itself a place in the hearts and minds of the masses, literally convert them to its point of view and out of the masses of careless and semi-sarcastic proletarians build up the flock which the Master instructed his clergy to guard and feed, but which in their devotion to power and wealth and the pettiest of social influences they have betrayed and neglected.

There are certain other functions which remain to the Church and which will have to disappear before the latter really recognizes that the problem which it must face is simply ethical and religious. One of these has been practically solved already in this country, namely, the direction of education in whole or in part by the Church. In England at the present time the Church, Anglican and Roman, is fighting almost desperately to retain control of education. Should it win, the chances of England to retain her position in the commercial world may be considered as irretrievably lost.

The education question is vital to the Church, as may be seen from the efforts which the Catholics, even in this country, make to maintain some sort of supervision over the children of the working classes, even at the heaviest sacrifice. The Sunday school of the Protestant Churches is a very weak substitute for that ecclesiastical control of education. It serves a certain social purpose,

but not that contemplated by the minister. It cannot escape notice that while the numbers of scholars attending Sunday school are very imposing, the ratio of adults attending church is small in comparison. What, then, becomes of the Sunday school scholars? They evidently do not retain their connection with the Church when they have reached maturity? To such the school merely served as a means of enabling them to pass the tedious hours of Sunday, without encroaching upon the peace of the family. It carries but little lasting influence and as a vehicle of appeal to the working classes is an unmitigated failure.

The function of dispenser of charity is another which the Church has heretofore exercised to its own power and well-being. The distribution of charity, then, has always given the Church a great amount of indirect influence, even among those who do not profit by its largess. This charity has been used to a certain extent as a proselyting influence, and then again much of it has been purely altruistic, expended by the Church without any hope of direct return. But whether the object of such charitable work has been selfish or altruistic, there is little doubt that it has been for the most part exceedingly unwise. The pauperization which is always to be dreaded in matters of charity has followed directly in the wake of ecclesiastical charitable effort, and there is a general growing feeling on the part of social experts against the perpetuation of the Church method of alleviating the evils of poverty. Organized charities, managed on a purely secular basis, municipal schemes for the prevention or the alleviation of poverty, State societies for the scientific treatment of juvenile offenders, substitutes of a state nature for magdalene institutions, and similar efforts are ever more and more taking the place of ecclesiastical institutions.

It will be noted that all this does not reflect in any way upon the value of the Church as a social factor in the past; it is only evidence of the curtailment of its social value in the future. And this is precisely with what we have to deal—how is a Church, without any political power, any social power, any control over education, any management of charitable funds, going to exert an influence over that great and unwieldy body known as the proletariat?

Many of the clergy refuse even to consider the question. They make closer and closer friends with those in power, they attach themselves still more nearly to the side of wealth and privilege, and by associating the name of religion with the capitalistic function are simply storing up wrath against the day of wrath and are establishing in the mind of the worker the idea which is not yet there established, that religion and capitalism are but two sides of the same shield.

Such a result would be unfortunate for the Church. The minister warm with the compliments of enthusiastic followers, may not think that there is any such danger, but the thing is not only possible, but it has actually happened. In Berlin to-day five out of six people who are to be seen upon the streets going to some meeting or other, are going not to church but to hear addresses from the platforms of the Social Democrats upon the rights and duties of the working classes. When their children have acquired the habit of substituting the lecture hall for the church, the latter will no longer confront a careless proletariat with no religion, but a sturdy proletariat with a very definite, if materialistic, substitute for religion, with an organization, with speakers who are at least as able as the theological colleges can produce, and without any doubt as to their working class sympathies. How long would it be before ecclesiastical authority could ever hope to reassert itself among such masses?

Still, the Church pays no attention to these warnings, and Mr. Baer, the slave-driver of the mining district, is allowed to utter his blasphemous declaration that he holds the power of life and death over his men by divine warrant, without an emphatic protest from those who claim to interpret the purposes of the Almighty.

The problem, then, of the relation of the Church to the working classes resolves itself into the simpler one of the relations of the Church to the individual workingman. But this may be still further simplified, thus. Bernard Shaw reminds us in the "Quintessence of Ibsenism," that the Church is simply an ideal, an unreality, having no foundation in fact. All that really exists comprises the various congregations with their respective ministers. So that our problem is narrowed finally to the relations between the individual minister and the individual workingman.

Now, under what conditions does the minister enter upon his work? It will appear at first sight that his very training and what is left of his professional status are distinct obstacles to any unity of interest on the part of the clergyman and the laborer. For the purpose of propaganda among the working classes it is rather bad policy to open relations from a superior position, that is, a position socially superior, for the purely ecclesiastical powers claimed by some of the clergy are not subversive of their progress with the working people. On the other hand, however, an assumption of social superiority by those who are supposed to have consecrated their lives to the teaching of other than material truths has a very deadening effect. It has always been so. The clergy who have really been influential have actually lived the life of the flock to which they have ministered.

It must be remembered that the workingman is not a confirmed secularist, and has never been one. The secularist societies

were not kept afloat by the efforts of the working class; hence it happened that Bradlaugh and Ingersoll were never in any sense champions of the working class, and that their opinions merely represented one side of middle-class philosophy.

If it were only the weak, the broken and the degraded who were lost to the Church, the latter might console herself even while she grieved, but, on the contrary, the strong, the vigorous and the pick of the working classes now avoid her portals, without whom she cannot expect or even deserve to perpetuate herself.

Austin Lewis.

Ideals and Shortcomings of Society.

COLONEL WATTERSON'S caustic remarks concerning the "simpering Johnnies and the tough girls that make Sherry's and Delmonico's 'hum,'" who he says have adopted the title "Smart Set" to save themselves "from a more odious description," have created wide discussion in pulpit, press, and as a topic of general conversation, which will undoubtedly be productive of beneficial results. Mrs. Burton Harrison's reply to Watterson in the New York American and Journal of Sept. 21, is in itself a strong arraignment of the class she attempts to defend. She says, "Folly, extravagance, exuberance that passes good form and sometimes decency; faults in abundance may be theirs," and no argument is necessary to prove what is thus conceded. Again she says of the "dwellers in the great houses of New York and Newport: * * * "Some of them are dull respectable people." * * * I hope she does not mean to imply that all respectable people are dull, for if she does, it is an admission of a conviction on her part more serious than Col. Watterson's most scathing charge. Yet I find this blasphemy not merely implied but boldly asserted in a comment by Edgar Saltus, upon the same subject and upon the same page. He says a society composed of people of perfect character "would be duller than the Smart Set," which he describes as the *ne plus ultra* of dullness. This remark indicates that he, as well as the "Smart Set" which he criticizes, is lacking in the realm of the ideal. It shows, rather, a confusion of ideas—a superposing of his own ideal of perfection upon a saint borrowed from the conception of some persecuting Puritan of the seventeenth century. A saint is an ideal of perfection, and dullness is not an attribute of that ideal. To assert that a society composed of saints would be dullness inconceivable, is a dangerous falsehood. What Mr. Saltus evidently means is that a society composed of saints (according to some other man's definition) would be dull companions for a society of saints (according to his own view), or, dull to him, in comparison with society as he finds it. His statement, however, that a person without moral deformity, or a society composed of such, would be inconceivably dull, is too serious a reflection upon the human race and the Creator of the Universe, to pass unchallenged. Not that I intend to pose as the champion of the Author of all things. He needs no defender, nor is the human race, in general, in need of a protector against such calumny. But I criticise the use of such an ill-advised expression, to warn the individual reader that the ideal of character and conduct are contained in the commandment, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father

in heaven is perfect," and that anyone who says that a society living up to that ideal would be inconceivably dull, gives evidence thereby of his own lack of moral perception. And let me say that the ideal contained in the above commandment may be kept in mind and constantly striven for, by any one who desires to attain it, regardless of external circumstances—whether among the rich, or poor, or those who, in material things, are blessed with the fulfillment of the prayer of Agar, "Give me neither poverty nor riches." It is my conviction that among these latter, the normal conditions necessary for the highest development obtain to the greatest degree, and it is for this reason that I advocate the establishment of a just social or industrial order, in which excessive wealth and poverty shall not exist, and in which every man will live by the service which he renders. "He that is chief among you, let him be as he that doth serve."

The time has gone by when a man, who, either in ignorance or hypocrisy, prates about those who attempt by legal process to usurp the birthright of society, and "exercise authority" over men arbitrarily, as "Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of the country," can gain an audience among intelligent people. Christianity asserts that such men were called "benefactors" among the Gentiles—"But ye (Christians) *shall not be so*." That is, a man cannot exercise arbitrary authority over his fellow men and be a Christian, no matter how vociferously Mr. Baer may call him one. He must recognize the laws of the Universe or his claim to that title is only a pretense or assumption. And I may add that a man who understands these laws would answer the question of Mr. Arthur M'Ewen, in the paper already quoted,—"*To be rich and to have nothing to do but spend your money—come now, wouldn't you like that yourself?*" with a NO big enough to blot out the entire insinuation which follows. To have money to spend without earning it, is demoralizing to the individual and to society. Integrity is an essential element in ideal character, and is absolutely incompatible with such enormous wealth in the hands of a few individuals as we are familiar with in this beginning of the twentieth century.

The question as to what one would do under the same circumstances, is idle speculation, and of infinitely less importance than the question, How shall just conditions be established? It is not my purpose to answer that question here, further than to say that it is comparatively easy to answer and requires strict honesty. My present purpose is to emphasize the fact that, "A man's life consists not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," or that the highest ideal of human development can be attained without excessive wealth which involves social injustice, and on

the other hand, cannot be attained with it. While the exploited class needs to learn how with the ballot box "to close its pockets with the button of the law against the fingers of the 'better classes'"—who live, as from time immemorial they have lived, by appropriating what others earn," the "appropriating" class needs also to learn to blush with shame that their fingers have been thus engaged. And this must be attained, not through class hatred, but—love,—the realization on the part of both classes, of the meaning of the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." There is no occasion for any feeling in one class against the other, for both are victims of a system which has been inherited by society from the days of chattel slavery, giving us, as Mr. Abram S. Hewitt says, a "custom of wages" based upon cost of subsistence, and still diverting the product of labor from the possession of the laborer to that of a master, now styled an "employer."

The "employer" is no more responsible for the system than the "employee,"—except, perhaps, from the fact that he has made a practice of lying, consciously or unconsciously, during a political campaign, and telling the "employee" that their "interests were identical," and from the further fact that a larger opportunity should have given him a deeper insight into economic law, and he should therefore have been first to discover the injustice of present conditions, and the remedy for them. But perhaps it is too much to expect that one whose income is increased by "faulty economic conditions" should detect these faulty conditions sooner than one whose income is diminished by them.

The fact remains, whatever the preceding circumstances, that "the evil in the trusts" exists, and in consequence we have the extravagance and insipidity at Newport on the one hand, and on the other hand the spectacle of starving miners striking for a subsistence wage. Both the underpaid miner and the overpaid "Newport pinhead who sits at table with a maudlinly-drunken chimpanzee" are an appalling reflection upon our civilization, and a single stroke of justice will abolish both, for be it known that the extravagance at Newport and elsewhere are the CAUSE of the dearth in the miner's cabin.

How long will the people of inordinate wealth continue to "put their trust in riches" as a means of securing happiness, (which is designated by the founder of Christianity as the "kingdom of heaven"—for really that is what every one is seeking), and though "having ears hear not" the words which come down to them through the centuries—the same which fell unheeded upon the ears of the rich young man of that former time—"ONE THING THOU LACKEST?" Not only are they deaf to those words, but they are also blind to the poverty and ill paid labor

which support their idle extravagance, not to speak of worse social crimes of which these unjust conditions are the cause.

But the fault lies not entirely with them but with society. The government, in the last analysis, was responsible for the tragedy witnessed upon Calvary, and the government to-day permits the injustice which manifests in the multimillionaire and the slum—the same cause produces both effects, and until the public conscience is aroused to realize the enormity of the crime, those who do recognize it must, if they have learned the lesson taught on Calvary, in the same spirit of love repeat the prayer which sprung from that experience—"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." But we can also be witnesses to the truth that the "Swell Set" which Col. Watterson in common with the vast majority of people disapproves, and the slums and ill paid labor which support idle luxury and extravagance—not to add debauchery and crime, which may be mostly traced to the same source—can both be done away by the simple process of abolishing monopoly and substituting just laws for those which now confer special privileges upon the few whereby they live at the expense of the producers of wealth.

To have wealth without earning it, and to earn wealth without having it are both *evils*, and until President Roosevelt learns this fundamental truth, he will seek to find "the evil in the trusts" in vain. When he learns it, to "destroy the evil in the trusts" will be within easy reach, and through the working of just laws, those now "wasting their substance in riotous living" will learn, even as the Prodigal of old, that they have "sinned against heaven," and that this is not life but a waste of life. Thus through the abolition of legalized injustice, will the mission of Christ be fulfilled, that all "may have life more abundantly." It is not possible to create Christians by legislation, but it is possible to legislate so as to make Christian living possible. Under present conditions, a man is compelled to be either "one of the robbers or one of the robbed," or the two combined. Non-dividend-paying capital, of which our public buildings, schools, streets, highways, parks, etc., are an example, is the solution of the "labor problem," and the Census Report shows the average working man's income will be more than doubled by such solution. Moreover, the unearned incomes of those who "live by appropriating what others earn," will cease, and the Scripture will be fulfilled which says, "If any will not work, neither shall he eat." The abolition of slavery may work some temporary hardship to those who have been living by the labor of others, but it will prove a blessing to all—'tis a labor of love.

Horace Mann.

Washington, D. C., Oct. 7, 1902.

Socialism in Politics.



SOCIALISM, as a science, must be sharply distinguished from Socialism as active in politics. As a science, it contemplates a rounded theoretical system; as a political movement, it aims at definite results. Scientific Socialism is the fluid fountain of moral force; Socialism in politics is the distribution of this force in society. This distribution means the realization of the ideal in positive institutions.

We may take for granted here that Socialism has been perfected into a science. The first question that arises, then, is: By what method shall it be realized? And naturally we inquire next, if there be a law which controls the process of realization? Let us see.

Existing society is rooted in capitalism. Socialism is the opposite pole. What one attracts, the other repels. Hence, the inevitable and irrepressible conflict. Socialism aims to dislodge capitalism, which fights for its life behind many and strong entrenchments.

The one superlative obstacle, however, which confronts us, is the ignorance, and indifference of the victims. They suppose, so far as they suppose anything, that the present order is fixed and permanent. Hence, the necessity of a propaganda of education.

Socialism in politics seeks to move men to action. How shall it accomplish this? Evidently it should follow the line of least resistance. While holding its large ideal constantly in view, it should not insist upon it in its entirety, but emphasize the specific evils which are seen and felt. The average popular mind can take this in, understand it, appreciate it, act upon it; but philosophize, it cannot. It is true this is not removing the tree by its roots, but if we continue lopping off the branches, the tree will die and the root rot in the ground.

There are those who object to this method as compromising and superficial. In no sense is it compromising. It makes an immediate demand, but surrenders no right to make other and further demands. If by "superficial" it is meant that the complete ideal is not presented to the people and its acceptance as a whole urged upon them, then this is begging the question and not an argument.

Further, these objectors need to be reminded of a law first enounced by Aristotle, that, "What is first in nature is last to us." With the Stagyrte "principle" means the life-giving source of a thing, as well as the major premise in a syllogism. Now in nature, or in the order of existence, the principle is always first;

but to our cognition it is always last. We ascend from facts to laws; from the manifestation of cause, to cause itself. We do not first grasp the law and the cause and descend from generals to particulars.

And, as it is in thought, so it is in action, notably in the social and political movement. All history is in evidence that no progression ever received its impulse from the *motif* of principle. It was the miseries of the poor debtors that led to the reforms of Solon; it was not the inherent right of all men to the soil that was at the bottom of the agitation stirred by the Gracchi; it was not freedom of conscience but the sale of indulgences that precipitated the religious revolution of the sixteenth century; Bill of Right, Petition of Right, Habeas Corpus, abolition of the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission—all the advances the English people have made in civil liberty (and this is the condition of economic freedom) have been remedies for special existing evils. It was the attempt to suppress American commerce and manufacture that brought on the Revolution of 1776; the ground of "no taxation without representation," was an after-thought. It was not the rights of man but the impositions on the Third Estate that assembled the States-General. Finally, it is the specific demands of the Erfurt program leveled against specific abuses that has given to Socialism its great strength in the German empire.

The bee constructs its comb so as to get the most storage in the smallest space without knowing the laws of geometry. The same economy prevails throughout the whole animal kingdom. Man, too, is always building better than he knows. Thus it would appear that society is a process, a kind of dialectic as it were, of unconscious evolution, in which instinct and not reason plays the principal parts.

Does some ask: "Has this 'Katheder' Socialism any practical purport?" I answer that it is intended to have such purport, and that it has failed totally if it has not.

The People's Party was, in its inception, strictly a farmers' party. It began with the Grange, went over into the Farmers' Alliance, then into the Independent Greenback Party, where it enlarged still further. The Mid-roaders claim to carry the original banner and that they have never amalgamated with a foreign element. They have now constituted themselves into the Allied Party in order to admit of a greater freedom of action and a combination with other progressive parties for a common purpose. Of course, I do not presume to speak for this party. But I know that what was contemplated by some of the founders was the purpose just stated.

This party has been the great training school for Socialism in

the United States. Fusion produced a retrograde movement on the part of the fusionists; but the Mid-roaders went straight forward and the platform adopted at Louisville is substantially the Eufurt program adapted to conditions in the United States.

The most of Mid-roaders and Socialists will one day get together, but there will be no mechanical work about it. It is quite possible they would be together now, had they understood each other better. There are some among us (Mid-roaders) who are as thorough-going Socialists as ever accepted the Marxian economy or followed Bebel and Liebknecht. But they think that the organized Socialists in this country lack the breadth of view and fail in the large practical endeavor which characterize the Socialists in Europe and which has given them such power in France and Germany. "Half-baked" is the classic epithet which some who claim to speak for the organized party apply to Socialists who are the same time Mid-roaders. And yet, these "half-baked" would be "done-browns" in Europe. It is true that a number of Mid-roaders do not rise above aspirations for a middle-class Utopia. But such is not the platform, nor is such the view of the great majority. Our great effort has been, and still is, to bring the farm and the work-shop to a consciousness of their natural solidarity. Marx expressly excludes from the category of capitalists those who produce for themselves with their own tools of production. Such a man is the small independent farmer, whether he owns the land and the stock, or the stock only. Such, too, is the country blacksmith and other mechanics outside of the larger towns and cities, many of whom own little homes but depend upon their labor for a living. If Socialism is not to be confined to the manufacturing centers, this rural class must not be ignored and put between the upper and the nether millstone of capitalist and proletarian.

William Macon Coleman.

Dallas, Texas.

The Struggle with Tuberculosis in Denmark.



COMMISSION which was appointed on the motion of the Socialist members of the Danish parliament in the fall of 1901 to consider measures with which to combat tuberculosis has just finished its work. Its report, which occupies a quarto volume of 250 pages, will occupy the attention of the Reichstag at its next session. In its introduction the commission expresses its regret that there are no accurate statistics of tuberculosis. Physicians are not compelled to report the cases which may occur in their practice, and in the country death certificates are not required. The total number of deaths from tuberculosis in Denmark is estimated at 5,000, of which 4,000 are from tuberculosis of the lungs. This constitutes one-seventh of the total deaths; but when the deaths of persons between 15 and 45 are considered, one-third of all are traceable to this one disease. The total number of patients perceptibly suffering from tuberculosis of the lungs is estimated at 20,000.

The commission recommends numerous measures to restrict the further spread of the disease; among others an arrangement by which the teachers of the public schools shall be permitted to deliver an annual address in all establishments that will permit it, to those engaged therein on the essentials of hygiene, and by further expositions by physicians in the higher schools. Besides this, the commission has prepared an outline of a law against tuberculosis, partially framed on the model of the one already existing in Norway.

An effective oversight of the milk trade is demanded, to be accompanied by gratuitous distribution of milk to needy mothers with no implication of charity; tubercular women to be forbidden to act as servants. No tuberculous person to serve as a teacher, and all who are at present acting as teachers to be retired upon an adequate pension. A careful supervision of all asylums, kindergartens, homes for cripples, private hospitals for children, etc., should be introduced, as well as of all school buildings. The introduction of school baths and school physicians is also demanded.

The commission makes the following significant comment concerning these measures: "The question of effective action against tuberculosis in adults is a question that enters in the highest degree into the social life, and *is closely connected with the whole social question*. Many measures that the commission considers highly necessary and desirable must be left undone, lest the battle against the disease become a fight against the patient, by making their fight for existence even harder than at present."

The commission expects a favorable result from the strict enforcement of the factory legislation of 1901, and recommends to the government the supervision of the erection and utilization of all places where large numbers of persons are accustomed to assemble, together with the frequent cleaning of all waiting rooms, railroad carriages and passenger steamers. Under certain conditions, when tuberculosis patients constitute a danger to their associates and will not themselves observe the proper precautionary measures, they should be forcibly placed in a hospital and cared for at public expense. Further and effective dwelling inspection is demanded and the enactment of building regulations, and finally the installation of a tuberculosis inspector is recommended.

As measures for the cure and care of the sick, the commission recommended: The erection of hospitals upon the seacoast for children having diseased glands, and sanitariums similarly located for the mildest cases of glandular disease, of sanitariums for poor people having lung diseases; tuberculosis hospitals or hospital isolation for the more advanced cases, and finally homes for the incurable cases.

According to the view of the commission these measures are only possible through state assistance, either by the state undertaking their complete execution, or else by granting a large subsidy. The commission refuses to endorse the recommendation of the Socialist member, Herald Jensen, that the state assume complete and gratuitous charge of all tubercular patients, partly because of the extraordinary extent of the disease and partly because of its slow development, which would require that a great number of citizens should for years at a time be cared for at public cost. The commission concludes, however, that the state should assume three-fourths of the cost of the care of tubercular patients, the other fourth to be met from the treasuries of the sick-benefit societies where the patient is a member of these, and where this is not the case to be paid by private or public charity. The annual expense of the state necessary for this purpose is estimated at 1,072,000 kroner. In addition to this there must be an immediate expenditure of 625,000 kroner for the erection of the different institutions. In the first fiscal year 425,808 kroner are demanded for the support of existing institutions. On all the essential points the commission was unanimous. The Socialist member, to be sure, recognized in a higher degree than his associates the duty of the state in the matter, but for practical purposes concurred in the recommendations of the commission.

Translated from the Berlin Vorwaerts by A. M. Simons.

The Conference of the International Committee.

THE delegates of the International Committee met on the 29th of December at the Maison du Peuple in Brussels. Delegates were present from England, France, Holland, Austria, Argentina, Poland, Belgium, and Russia.

Secretary Serwy presented his report, of which the following is an abstract:

The activity of the International Secretary is not so extensive as seems desirable because the necessary money is lacking to pay a man who shall devote his time exclusively to this work, and because we have undertaken so great a task that some time is required to get our bearings.

The Secretary has sought in all possible ways to fulfill the demands. The International Committee should consider the question of the organization of a special Interparliamentary Commission in order to discuss common action in great political and economic questions. This Commission must be co-ordinate with the International Committee. The International Secretary must be enabled to gather International archives and create a central Bureau of books, documents and reports which bear upon the labor movements of the various nations.

The first duty of the Secretary was the organization of the Bureau. Twenty-one nations are now represented therein: England, Germany, Austria, Australia, Argentina, Belgium, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Denmark, United States, Spain, France, Holland, Italy, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Servia and Switzerland.

In the course of 1901 several Manifestoes were published; the first upon the unrest in Russian Universities; the second upon the occurrences of the celebration of the 1st of May; the third in relation to the Armenians, and the fourth concerning the concentration camps in South Africa.

Further, the Secretary has given rise to Parliamentary interpellation on various questions. The resolutions of the National Congress were collected and published. From time to time International bulletins were published in *Le Peuple*. The Secretary was often consulted concerning matters of labor, social legislation and the Socialist movement. The archives have been enriched by a number of Socialist publications, protocols, and brochures, as well as by the publications of the Belgian, French and American Labor bureaus. Statistical material concerning the political and economic labor movements of Europe and the United States have been gathered and a book prepared on the development of Social-

ism at the end of the 19th century. If means are forthcoming a book will be published in 1903 on the Socialist and labor movement of Europe, America and Asia. It will contain a general report of the progress of Socialism since the Paris Congress of 1889 and the political, economic and co-operative power of Socialism, and the development of the press and influence of propaganda.

The Secretary has endeavored to answer the many and various questions that have been addressed to him from comrades concerning organization, housing of labor, alcoholism, voting, immigration, conditions of labor, strikes, legislation, etc.

An attempt which has been made to create an International Socialist Library has had little results. Efforts are now being made to secure the co-operation of authors, and it is hoped to obtain better results.

At the request of the Russian representative of the Bureau, the Secretary protested against the enslavement of Finland by Russia. At the time of the festival of the 1st of May conquest and robbery politics in the Orient, in Africa, in Cuba and the Philippines were denounced. Another question which came before the Conference was on motion of Comrade Hyndman for more active participation by the Bureau in International politics.

On motion of Comrade Singer it was agreed to postpone the next International Congress until the year 1904.

The Bureau finally adopted the resolution: that the International Bureau considers it necessary that the questions of International politics be given more exact and thorough study by the Socialist parties of all countries and by the Bureau itself. The Socialist parties of all countries were requested to bring reports to the next Congress concerning the International situation and especially of conditions which in any way may compromise peace and of measures which may aid in the abolition of national antagonisms.

Comrade Hyndman sought to have the Bureau meet quarterly, but it was finally decided to meet only twice in each year. The next meeting will be held in August, 1903.

International Socialist Congress of Amsterdam.

THE International Bureau at Brussels has received the following notices which are intended to be brought forward at the Socialist Congress to be held at Amsterdam.

1. From the FEDERATIVE UNION OF THE CENTRE (France).
 1. General Strike.
 2. Suppression of Standing Armies.
 3. Extension of the International Secretariat.
 4. In all countries a nine hours day to be worked for.
2. From the SOCIALIST PARTY OF FRANCE (Union Socialiste Revolutionnaire).
 5. International rules of Socialist politics.
3. From the SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.
 6. Proposals for National and International legislation on Emigration and Immigration.

The object of these proposals is to enable our comrades in Argentina to fight against the introduction of large numbers of emigrants in that country, which reduces wages there.

4. From the NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIALIST WOMEN IN AUSTRIA.
 7. Proposals for the obtaining of the right of women to vote.

They state that though resolutions on the subject were adopted in 1891 at Brussels, and in 1900 at Paris, yet no active propaganda is carried on to enable this to be obtained, and they ask that an agitation should be started for that object.

5. The FABIAN SOCIETY (England) sends the following resolutions:—

8. Compulsory Arbitration.

The attention of the Congress is called to the hardships entailed by strikes and lockouts among workers, and they are urged to adopt similar methods to those prevailing in New Zealand and New South Wales, where compulsory arbitration already exists.

9. A Minimum Legal Wage.

The Congress is recommended to urge the adoption of a minimum wage as already exists in Victoria (Victoria Wage Boards Law) or in England by means of agreement between workers and employers.

10. Trade Unionism and Politics.

The attention of the Congress is called to the happy results ensuing from co-operation between trade unionists and Socialists, but as reactionary candidates are sometimes chosen from trade

unionists, Socialist organizations are urged to always maintain their organization.

11. Municipization of the Drink Traffic.

The attention of Congress is called to the evils of the drink traffic, and it is urged that this should be undertaken by public authorities, so that the profit may accrue to the State or the municipality.

The INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY wishes the question of MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM to be considered.

12. Socialists and Municipal Activity.

The attention of Congress is called to the importance of this matter, and urges Socialists, while not neglecting the national and international aspects of Socialism, to take part in local work in order—

1. To make all local work public property.
2. To carry on this work, not for profit, but for the public good.
3. To watch over public health.
4. To help the sick, children, men out of work, and old people.
5. To provide better homes for the people.
6. To improve the condition of the municipal workers.

The CZECH SOCIALISTS OF AUSTRIA ask that

13. The International Proletariat should consider the question of Nationalities.

They urge that this question if discussed would tend to prevent war.

The DUTCH SOCIALIST PARTY proposes the consideration of

14. Old age pensions for men and women unable to work.

The PARTI OUVRIER FRANCAIS (Federation Girondine) states

15. That Foreign Correspondents of Socialist newspapers should either be members of Socialist bodies or in sympathy with them.

The International Bureau requests that Socialist organizations should debate these questions and submit to us, as soon as possible, their report. We also ask them to send us before the first of May a report on the movement in their country since the International Socialist Congress of 1890, at Paris.

Victor Serwy, Secretary.

Edward Bernstein and Industrial Concentration.



OMRADE Edward Bernstein has honored me with a reply to the few casual remarks in criticism of his theories, contained in my article, "How Much Have the Trusts Accomplished?" (I. S. R. for October, 1902). Before I meet Mr. Bernstein's objections let me briefly state the question at issue, so that no misrepresentations or misunderstandings be possible, or even be suspected. I fear that my arguments will be somewhat technical and tiresome, and would gladly abstain from replying altogether, were not some important principles involved.

My article concludes with the following sentences: "Mr. S. N. D. North says: * * * 'You are quite right that in almost all of the great lines of industry the tendency is to a decrease in the number of separate establishments, accompanying a large increase in the amount of capital invested, number of employes and value of products.'

"Yet those are all assertions, the truth of which a Bernstein will contest."

Mr. Bernstein takes exception to this last statement: "I can heartily endorse what Mr. North says without in the slightest degree contradicting my own statement," he replies. That he does so now, is a source of gratification to me. Mr. Bernstein claims more, however: that there is no contradiction at all between Mr. North's statements, which I quoted and endorsed, and his theories as expressed in the "*Voraussetzungen des Socialismus*." To prove this, he quotes the following sentence from his book:

"If the incessant progress of technical methods and centralization in a growing number of branches of industry is a truth, the significance of which even blockheaded reactionists scarcely hide from themselves to-day, it is a truth not less established that in quite a number of trades small and medium establishments prove to be perfectly able to live at the side of great establishments. Also in industry there is no pattern of evolution of equal validity for all trades" (pp. 57-58).

So the matter stands.

Let us proceed systematically and examine Mr. Bernstein's quotation a little more carefully. Can it serve as sufficient evidence that he agrees with Mr. North's statements? We will eliminate the misunderstanding that may arise from the promiscuous use of the words of "industry" and "trade," by explaining that "trade" here evidently stands for "branch of industry." This is evidently so in the last sentence, though in the first "trade" and "industry" seems to be used as opposites, which we don't exactly

understand. However, I disregard that. The question is: Does Mr. Bernstein or does he not admit concentration of industry? What is the answer?

Why, the answer is very simple, indeed. If by "centralization" is meant "concentration," Mr. Bernstein admits it in the first half of the sentence, while he denies it in the second half. Or, rather, while he admits the general statement he denies the specific elements, that make up that statement. And let me add right here, that this is one of the many examples of loose statistical writing which made me express my doubts of the scientific value of those statistics—express it perhaps a little too strongly, I admit.

For what is concentration? It is not a static fact, it is a dynamic, or evolutionary tendency. It can not be studied from what exists at a certain moment, but from a comparison of a condition of things at different times. Again what are the specific phenomena that constitute industrial concentration? Mr. North defines them, and Mr. Bernstein agrees. What are they?

First: Decrease in the number of separate establishments.

Second: Increase in the amount of capital invested.

Third: Increase in the number of employes.

Fourth: Increase in the value of products.

Had we noticed these tendencies in only one or two lines of industry, we would then speak of concentration in these particular lines. But as they can be noticed in *almost all* American industries (as Mr. North says, and as can be very easily proved by a statistical study), and as in an evolutionary study we emphasize the general rule and not the exceptions,—we have the right to speak of a rapid concentration of industry as a whole.

Now, then, what does Mr. Bernstein admit and what does he deny? "In quite a number of trades small and medium establishments prove to be perfectly able to live at the side of great establishments!" Able to live! When? Just to-day, this year? Then it is undoubtedly true and does not contradict concentration, for all small and medium establishments are not dead yet, evidently they are able to live. But, should it mean that they are not diminishing, not dying out, how does it agree with the statement that "the number of separate establishments is decreasing? If the number is decreasing some must be dying off! And it must be the smaller ones, as "capital, number of workmen, value of products, are all increasing notwithstanding the decrease in the number of establishments.

Yes, Mr. Bernstein will answer, all these things happen in some, and do not happen in other branches of industry. And that's why I say, 'There is no pattern of evolution of equal validity for all trades.'

But there is no escape. Mr. North's statement does not read

"In some * * *" but "In almost all * * *" Isn't there a difference?

Mind you, I am not discussing the merits of the case at all, but simply trying to define as clearly and as accurately as I can Comrade Bernstein's view from his own statement. I really think I have omitted "a few words from my article." It ought have concluded, "A Bernstein will contest, *if he chooses to be consistent and careful in his statements,*" and by "a Bernstein" I meant of course any one of his followers, not feeling justified in coining an English equivalent for the German Bernsteinianer.

I have proven, I think, that Mr. Bernstein's defense was not a very strong one. The question remains open, however, what does he think about concentration of industry? What grounds did I have to think, that he will deny it. For that we must subject the third section of the third chapter of the Voraussetzungen to a more critical examination.

On page 59 he says (we quote in German for fear of misrepresenting while translating): "So stellt sich im Ganzen, das Bild heute so dar, als ob nicht der Grossbetrieb beständig kleine und Mittelbetriebe aufsaugte, sondern als ob er lediglich *neben* ihnen aufkaeme. Nur die Zwergbetriebe gehen absolut und relativ zurueck. Was aber die Klein und Mittelbetriebe abbetrifft, so nehmen auch sie zu." And he proceeds to give statistics in support of this statement. As we are not now discussing the subject of concentration but only Mr. Bernstein's relation to the question, we will not criticize the statistics. Note this, however. He speaks here of the whole picture: "das Bild im Ganzen," without looking for exceptions, and asserts that the number of establishments, small, medium and large, is increasing. Yet he insists that he has never uttered words which would justify my conclusion that he would deny a decrease of establishments.

On page 61 he speaks of commercial enterprises: "Nicht die Grossen machen den Kleinen die morderische Konkurrenz, diese letzteren besorgen das Geschaefit gegenseitig nach Möglichkeit. * * * Der Kleine Mittelbetrieb zeigt die starkste Zunahme." Here, too, there is the evident desire to prove *that there is no concentration*. Our opponent may be right. But why is he so anxious to deny that he had asserted those things?

We could multiply these examples, but I think I have said enough to prove the following statements. *In Mr. Bernstein's well-known book denials of the general process of industrial concentration are certainly to be found. They take the form, however, of a denial of the specific elements of this general process, and the general admission of the process in loose terms which precedes these denials does not correct the matter, but spoils the logic, for these denials play an important part in the entire eco-*

conomic system that bears the name of Bernstein. It was my privilege therefore to bring these arguments to a "reductio ad absurdum," in which I believe to have succeeded. For I have shown, that these "Marxists" deny a conclusion which follows from Marxist premises, while even capitalist writers have been forced to acknowledge this conclusion. A "reductio ad absurdum" is in my opinion a very powerful argument, provided your opponent is willing to follow the logical reasoning with you. If, however, he refuses to do so, that cannot be helped.

I purposely took all possible care to avoid any discussion of the question itself: first, because that was not the issue, and, second, because a statistical study of the evolution of American industry had better been undertaken by itself and not in a polemic article. Yet, if my opponent should desire to continue the discussion I can undertake to prove that at least in the United States, the one country of whose economic evolution I may claim a first-hand knowledge, his views and conclusions are incorrect; not only in regard to concentration of industry, but in many other matters as well. That the process is identical in Germany, England, etc., I may believe, but am unable to prove at present. That much I may say: that many of the statistical tables in "Die Voraussetzungen, etc.," if carefully and critically examined, lead to diametrically different conclusions from those the author made.

"Your American experience is no law unto us," Mr. Bernstein may very properly answer. Neither are German statistics conclusive to the American Socialist, however. My remarks were directed not against Comrade Bernstein personally, but against the American "Bernsteinianer," who persist in denying the correctness of a Marxist interpretation of modern economic life in America,—because of their teacher's German and English statistics. It is from their side that I looked for a reply, but unfortunately it is not forthcoming.

Dr. I. M. Rubinow.

EDITORIAL

Violence and the Socialist Movement.

The economic organization of labor has now reached a point never before dreamed of in its history. A literal wave of trade-union sentiment has swept across the country. This was preceded and to some extent caused by an even greater wave of industrial concentration.

The upward sweep of prosperity has probably well-nigh reached its height. Such men as Yerkes, Hill and the editors of the great commercial publications, whose interests would all lie in claiming the perpetuity of present conditions, admit that an industrial crisis cannot be far away.

During the time of the upward sweep of capitalism the price of living has soared far above the slowly crawling rate of wages. Hence there have been an extraordinary number of strikes and other evidences of the class struggle during the last few months. But when the inevitable reaction shall come and the capitalists can no longer afford to throw to labor even the few crumbs which now break the force of its onslaught the struggle will at once grow far more fierce and bitter.

It is only necessary to call to mind how the panic of 1873 was followed by the massacre of striking laborers by the militia in the streets of Pittsburg and the Pennsylvania mines in 1877, how the "depression" of 1884 culminated in the great eight-hour movement and went out in blood in the streets of Chicago in 1886, and how the terrible panic of 1893 was followed by the bloody industrial conflict at Pullman in 1894, to show the close connection between the first pressure of financial panic and the coming of fierce industrial battles.

In view of these facts it does not require prophetic insight to foresee the probability of great industrial and social disorder within the near future. Unless causes cease to produce effects, the next few years will see industrial conflicts that will dwarf the A. R. U. and the coal strike as completely as those eclipsed the conflicts of former years.

But it is generally recognized that during even these less important conflicts there were times when the social fabric was stretched perilously close to the bursting point. To-day there is much more inflammable material on hand than at any previous time in our history. The crushed mass of little capitalists are growing desperate, and, true to the traditions of their class, are preparing for a violent policy. It is very probable that they will also remain true to their traditions

on another point and keep their own precious skins safe while inciting others to fight for them.

The organs of this class—the so-called “radical” papers—are constantly hinting at violence. This is done not so much by open propaganda of violence as by publishing inflammatory comparisons and contrasts between social classes, tending to inspire to class-hatred, but not to intelligent class consciousness or conception of the historical functions of class struggles, and never pointing out the logical methods, weapons and outcome of such struggles.

There are many reasons for believing that the present social rulers, the large capitalist class, would not look with disfavor upon an appeal to violence at this time. They cannot be wholly blind to the fact that events in Europe for the last generation, and more recently in this country, indicate the near approach of the time when the whole system of capitalism will be brought to trial, with a good prospect of its abolition. Even if they have not comprehended the full significance of the growing Socialist movement (and we must continuously guard against ascribing too much far-sightedness to them in this respect) it is certain that they are beginning to realize that the economic organization of labor cannot proceed much further without seriously interfering with the workings of international competitive capitalism.

Since, then, it seems certain that the relative strength of capitalism will never be greater than now, it follows that if the forces in opposition to the present exploiting class are ever to be conquered it must be soon. That any victory that might be so gained would be at all final, no Socialist, of course, for a moment imagines. It would take more than one violent upheaval and massacre of the workers, and in more than one country, to stay the course of social evolution that is making for Socialism. But such social disorder might well have important effects upon the immediate direction and rate of social progress.

The social tinder now on hand needs only some violent clash of classes to strike the spark to ignite it, and with the ruling classes ready to fan the flames, we have all the elements essential to a social conflagration.

The only great body which has nothing to gain and everything to lose from such a period of social violence is the proletariat. All the great basic forces of social evolution are working for the political domination and economic emancipation of the working class. These forces work with greater certainty and more effectively and intelligently under the impulse of peaceful economical development than in times of social disorder. But this really offers but another reason why those who are interested in the maintenance of capitalism should invite violence.

The recent move to take the control of the State militia out of the hands of the States and vest that control completely in the central government is one of the signs that the ruling class is preparing for violence in the near future. The great sensation raised by the hostility of the unions to the militia shows how tender a spot this point is with the present ruling class.

The question at once arises as to what action the prospect of social disorder demands of the Socialist movement. There is but one answer

to this question, and that is neither new or startling. It is ORGANIZE. Organization of the intelligent class conscious portion of the working class into a coherent body, with a clear recognition of the significance of social forces and a definite purpose as to the utilization of those forces is the surest way, first, to prevent any violent action, and, second, such an organization is the only security that the proletariat will be able to maintain its interests as a class, as well as the higher interests of the social whole, the maintenance of which constitutes its historical mission, during a time of social disorder.

If there were but seventy-five or an hundred thousand members of the working class organized in the effective, fighting, working, thinking organization of the Socialist Party, such an organization could do much to prevent any foolish and violent response to provocative action by the ruling class. They would be able to direct the tremendous but blind forces that arise during economic and physical conflicts into what is to-day without doubt the most effective channel for social progress—that of political action for the purpose of capturing the governmental machinery, now the citadel of class rule and oppression, in order to use that machinery for the abolition of all economic and political tyranny.

During the immediate future, at least, the watchword of the Socialist Party everywhere should be, organize, organize, ORGANIZE. Socialist papers should aim above all else to draw their readers within the party organization. Local, State and national machinery should be used to the utmost to see that new territory is invaded and that that already covered is more efficiently organized. Only by so doing can class-consciousness be given a means of effective, intelligent expression, and the Socialist Party fulfill its purpose as the guiding force of the proletariat in its march towards its own emancipation, and the realization of its historic mission as the bringer in of a higher social stage for humanity.

The International Congress.

It may smack of disrespect to those whose names are reckoned among the "great" in Socialism to condemn the work of the International Socialist Bureau and the program which is presented for discussion at the International Congress. But to put the matter frankly, the questions which are offered for consideration seem on the whole to be almost childish and utterly unfitted to occupy the attention of a body of supposed experts on Socialist thought and tactics gathered from all over the world. Practically every question submitted is one of tactics, which has only a limited application. Some are actually silly. Think, for example, of spending several thousands of dollars, and as we value time to-day that is what even a few hours of discussion in such a body means, over the character of correspondents to Socialist papers. Such questions as standing armies, general strike, woman suffrage, restriction of emigration and several others are peculiar to certain countries, and of doubtful importance or slight relation to Socialism anywhere.

Every one of these questions are affected to a high degree by local

peculiarities, are of much more importance in some localities than in others, and of no interest at all in many places. Some of them are mere bourgeois reforms, that have already been secured in many countries.

Most important of all, not a single one of them can in the slightest degree be settled by any international action. It might be well to gather information upon these various questions through international correspondence for publication, although even that would be of doubtful value, but to ask men to come together across thousands of miles of land and water to discuss them is foolish.

In this connection it is perhaps fortunate that the next International Congress has been postponed one year, as this will give time for discussion of this program and the adoption of a better one. But on this point we cannot help but remark at the free and easy way in which the fact that the United States will be engaged in a great national campaign at the time fixed for the Congress was disregarded by the European comrades. Arrangements should be made, however, to send several delegates and to have the time of meeting either in November, after election or else in June before the campaign is in full swing, preferably the former, so that those delegates who wished might remain some time without being absent during the time they are needed here.

In this connection there is another phase of international affairs that is worthy of notice. It is recognized that the German Social Democracy are on the eve of what is probably the most important electoral contest for the Socialist movement that has ever been held. Some of the German comrades in New York have already shown their appreciation of this fact and expressed their sense of international solidarity by sending a hundred dollar contribution to the campaign fund of the German Social Democrats. It would seem as if it might be well to extend this principle somewhat further and to issue a general call through the American party press for funds for this purpose, or even to use the national party machinery to the same end. As time passes elections will come to be of greater and greater importance, and there will come times when it will be desirable to concentrate, for the moment, the entire international strength of the movement on some particular national contest. It would be well to get the machinery of co-operation in readiness against that day. The proletariat is a perennial source of funds on a small scale, but is incapable of raising any great sum on short notice. Hence it is that such appeals would not mean the augmenting of the resources of one country at the expense of the exhaustion of others, but, on the contrary, would be more apt to increase the contributing strength of the whole Socialist movement.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Germany.

The tariff law has been passed by an open violation of the constitution. But the capitalists have not yet landed their spoils in safety. It has not yet been decided when the law will take force, and the next Reichstag's elections are rising on the political horizon like a threatening cloud. If the Socialists return to that body in considerably increased numbers they can continue the fight with redoubled vigor and possibly force the old parties to modify or repeal the noxious law. But if it is carried into effect, then the Nemesis will reach the capitalists in the form of economic blows. It remains to be seen whether the new tariff will make itself felt immediately after its enactment, and if it will be possible to celebrate treaties of commerce that will weaken its effects. The most important commercial treaties will be renewed on December 31, 1903. If no new treaties are made, then Germany would be forced to enter into a tariff war with the leading countries of the world. The great mass of the people will feel the pressure in either case. If no new treaties are made with other countries, the price of the necessities will rise. And, if the new tariff is carried into effect, the condition of the masses will be still more deteriorated. The result will be a further increase of the Socialist sentiment.

The illegal proceedings of the capitalist majority in the Reichstag have caused a great stir, even in honest conservative circles. Professor Laband, a prominent conservative jurist, declares in the "Deutsche Juristen Zeitung" that "such proceedings violate the dignity of the Reichstag," and that "the lex Groeber has been justly denounced as a brutal misuse of the powers of the majority." He shows that the Socialists have actually been the law-abiding force, while the elements of "law and order" have precipitated a revolution from above in the interest of reaction.

The Krupp affair has also put another feather into the hat of "Vorwaerts." The public prosecution has been suddenly abandoned, and later events seem to show that this was done because the secret police did not succeed in bringing employees of the "Vorwaerts" to divulge the secrets of the case. At least the secret police has paid one of the messengers of the Socialist organ sixty mark as a first installment for carrying secret news to them. And in consequence "Vorwaerts" now carries at the head of its columns the following notice:

"We have at our office SIXTY MARK, which were paid to one of our messengers on January 13, in the Schiller restaurant, as an inducement

ment to break faith with us and reveal business secrets to the political police. The owner of this money can secure the same on receipting for it and proving his identity."

All this is, of course, a well-deserved defeat for the emperor. To make his resentment still stronger, the workingmen of the Stettin "Vulcan," the great shipyard, sent him a telegram protesting against the resolution of sympathy with Krupp, which they declare was forced upon them by a threat of discharge.

A still greater blow was directed at the emperor by the Socialist representatives in the Reichstag, who sharply criticised him for his insolent meddling in affairs of a public nature, and who forced Count von Ballestrem, the speaker of the Reichstag, to resign, after he had tried to shut off the discussion of this subject.

Of course, the ruler is furious, and is stumping the country in an effort to draw votes away from the Socialist party. It is an easy thing to make hot campaign speeches against the Socialists when they are muzzled by lese majesty laws and cannot hit back. It seems that the divine ruler has not the courage to meet the Socialists in open debate, and prefers to fight, like a cowardly sneak, surrounded by his henchmen, and striking men who are gagged and bound by unjust laws. What a hero!

However, the Socialists say they are well satisfied with the results of the imperial activity. The cities all over the country are stirred by public meetings passing resolutions of protest against the tariff law. And every new election brings news of new Socialist victories. In Breslau the emperor's anti-Socialist speech was posted in all the factories on the eve of election, and the result was a greater Socialist majority than ever. In Liegnitz the same effect of the imperial propaganda was hailed with delight by the Socialists. In fact, the emperor is doing so well that the next Reichstag will doubtless show a goodly increase in the number of men who will castigate the imperial tongue with the frankness and fearlessness for which the German Socialists have become known and dreaded.

New Zealand.

Comrade Tom Mann has a contribution in a recent issue of the "Pilot," a reform paper published at Auckland, from which we reproduce the following passage:

"The bitter weather of the past few weeks in the South Island, and part of the North, has made the 'out of works' feel their position very acutely. Auckland seems to have a large share of unemployed, but it's not the only district that has them. In Wellington there are men who have had no work for months, who would be glad of work at ordinary rates of pay, but who cannot get it. The unemployed problem has not been solved in this or any other colony or country as yet. The government co-operative scheme is better than nothing, but it in no way meets the real requirements; and the untruthful boasts of the Premier in London as to the non-existence of poverty in New Zealand ought not to be allowed to pass quietly by whilst hundreds of men are tramping

through the colony, literally begging, absolutely cadging, for an existence. The Government Labor department cannot, or will not, give them work; they cannot get assistance from the Charitable Aid Boards, and in this glorious land of plenty there is not even a 'Casual Ward,' nor anything of so humane a character, to which the helpless-out-of-work can go. Some of the officials in connection with the Central District Labor department offices are as kindly disposed as men can be, but others seem to take pleasure in snubbing a man who turns up to get information as to the probability of a situation being known of. If the applicant is a single man he is frequently spoken of in terms that implies he is a criminal loafer, or otherwise he would not be there. Labor department, don't be quite so cocksure in your statements that there are so very few out of work; you may get a rude awakening, and some of you amply deserve it."

The following editorial remarks also throw a flood of light on the actual conditions in that workingmen's "Paradise" and tell quite another story than certain much advertised fiction:

"Is New Zealand a workingman's paradise? Not much. Not so long as sweating exists, not until the wage system is thrown overboard altogether. Not while there are bosses and employes. Not while there are workers who have not had the opportunity to receive the first rudiments of education. Not while the wage-earners truckle and crawl and toady to the lawyer, the parson, the land thief, and the money thief; not while a sentiment of jingoism can be fanned to life; not until there are equal rights and equal opportunities for all men and women; not until all have their capacities thoroughly developed by education; not until the Co-operative Commonwealth of New Zealand is established, will our country be a workingman's paradise.

"'The Britain of the South' is quite an apt name for New Zealand, especially in the shooting season, when only the haw-haw Johnnie, who can afford the license, is allowed to shoot imported game, which fattens on the toil of the well-taxed farmer. Smacks very much of the tyranny of privilege in the old country."

France.

In one of his latest banquet speeches Millerand has made a clean breast of everything which Socialist tactics should include, according to him. In the first place, the Socialist party should disregard the class lines drawn by Marxian Socialism and adopt a "broader" plan of action. We then ought to assist the capitalists in maintaining "law and order," in voting funds to the capitalist government for military and colonial expenses, and co-operate with the capitalists to "increase the productivity and wealth of the country." Most of all, he regards it as "a weakness akin to treason" to give up the idea of accepting a cabinet position from the capitalist government. He hopes that the next national convention of the Jauresists will declare in favor of "complete reform tactics."

This is not surprising. Once on the inclined plane of compromise and fusion, he could not help sliding gracefully and smoothly into what

the "Communist Manifesto" calls bourgeois Socialism, and what is properly called bourgeois reform. If his party follows him to the logical consequences of his philosophy, as it probably will, they will have accomplished the same thing which the American populist leaders did in 1896—that is, betrayed their constituents and given up their right to existence as a distinct political party.

The French capitalists will yet hail Millerand as the saviour who broke the splendid spirit of the French Socialist movement and transformed it into a tame and docile lackey of the radical bourgeoisie. And the working class will gradually awake from the slumber into which the Millerand-Jaures program has cradled them, and, with a deep sigh over the many lost years that can never be regained, proceed to reorganize on more uncompromising lines. But the opportunists will have succeeded in doing what they so frequently profess to aim at, viz., "gained time." In other words, they will have assisted in keeping the working class in wage slavery so much longer, and in teaching them the bitter object lesson that workingmen cannot trust themselves to leaders whose whole instincts and environment are bourgeois to the core.

Jaures has been elected fourth vice president of the *Chambre des Deputes*. How well the bourgeois press appreciate the value of his services may be inferred from the following statement of the Paris correspondent of the *London Times*: "The victory of Mr. Jaures is more than a personal success—indeed, it is doubtful whether, judged solely in this light, the eloquent Socialist leader's opportunities for individual action and initiative are not thereby diminished, and whether his elevation to a rank in which he holds officially a position of lieutenant of Mr. Bourgeois may not determine an evolution in his political career, tempering it to an opportunism which will make him as little dangerous to vested interests as was Mr. Millerand when in office."

Switzerland.

The workingmen who refused to obey the summons to do militia duty in the recent strike in Geneva have been sentenced to imprisonment. Numerous contributions are made toward a fund to reimburse them for the losses they are thus suffering. The reactionaries have been very busy of late, and the freedom of the Swiss republic is setting the working classes to thinking as never before. The *lex Bertoni*, which makes it a criminal offense to publicly criticize foreign rulers, and the *lex Peuple*, which muzzles the press in its criticism of occurrences in the army, are stirring up a great deal of comment. Incidentally, the following remark of a Swiss writer throws a new light on the value of the referendum for the capitalist politicians: "If we wish to protest against these laws, we must spend energy and money in collecting 30,000 signatures, and we are still engaged in collecting signatures against the new tariff law. The referendum is a splendid means of exhausting the funds of the minority parties."

And a correspondent of the "*Vorwaerts*" writes: "The reaction has

celebrated its orgies in class justice, in brutally refusing the petitions to release the men who had been sentenced in consequence of the Geneva strike, in the *lex Peuple*, in the *lex Bertoni*, and in the creation of a new tariff on imports. But the workingmen will pass a verdict against these capitalist brutalities at the next election."

Italy.

The Italian Chamber has adopted the bill of the government for the municipalization of public utilities, with 156 against 81 votes. The bill is framed in such a manner that the capitalists are not in the least hurt, for it amounts to nothing less than an annuity for them without the trouble of supervising their wage slaves and bothering with business troubles. The Socialists declared that the bill in this form was worthless for the working class, and voted against it. Municipalization by the wolves—in the interest of the lambs, of course. Italy thus enters on a course of municipal and state capitalism, and our opportunists will now get an opportunity to study their ideal of a "gradual growth of society into Socialism" under the paternal wings of the capitalist government.

In Catania a popular referendum on the question of installing a municipal bakery declared in favor of the measure, with 5,058 against 145 votes. The Socialists led a parade of twenty thousand people after the vote became known.

The public prosecutor has instituted a process against the Socialist organ of Naples, "*La Propaganda*," which had furnished the information about Krupp to the Berlin "*Vorwaerts*." The charge is "Violation of public morals." The "*Vorwaerts*" says in a dry comment: "It has taken the Italian authorities quite a good while to discover that public morality is not violated by immorality, but by the exposure of immorality."

A recent letter of the Pope to the bishops of Italy says, among other things, that the priests should offer an energetic resistance to the pernicious tendencies of the new century. They should descend to the people with the true spirit of the Church and save them from impostors, especially from the Socialists. Of course, the Pope has no right to make any binding rules for priests on economic and political matters, and neither a self-respecting priest, nor a lay Catholic who believes in using his own brain, will take any notice of this arbitrary ruling. But it will be very gratifying to the great number of Catholic Socialists in this country to learn that, according to the official announcement of the infallible Pope, the true spirit of the Church is opposed to the abolition of wage slavery and of economic oppression.

Holland.

In the after elections to the Parliament, Comrade Troelstra was elected in Amsterdam by a vote of 3,397 against 2,505. Over one thousand votes more were cast in this after election than in the main election, and our comrade received more than 900 of the new votes. This

election is a great surprise and disappointment to the capitalists, for as late as June, 1901, Comrade Henri Polak was defeated in the same district. This is so much more remarkable, as two out of every three workingmen are disfranchised in Amsterdam. Comrade Polak was elected to the Municipal Council of Amsterdam by 2,610 votes, against 1,052 liberal and 716 clerical votes. His district is one of the proletarian sections of the city, and his election, as well as that of Comrade Troelstra, is an encouraging sign of progress among the working class of that city.

Sweden.

In recent municipal elections the Socialists scored victories, in spite of the outrageous suffrage laws. Both Socialist candidates were elected in Malmoë, against the combined capitalist parties. Comrade Nielss Persson received 53,424 votes, Comrade A. Nilsson, the editor of "Arbetet," 39,171. Other Socialist candidates received from 18,000 to 20,000 votes, but were defeated. In Gefle, Comrade O. Danielsson was re-elected by a vote of 30,171. In Halmstad the Socialist candidate received 1,340 votes, in Sundsval 6,939, in Eskilstuna 10,182. In Soeder-tele the Socialist candidate was defeated by a small majority. But this defeat would have been a great victory under an equitable suffrage. There are 20,000 municipal electors in that town. But in consequence of tax debts and business failures, their number was reduced to 18,382 this year. Now, 200 wealthy citizens cast 9,619 votes, while the 16,382 others could only cast 8,783 votes. It looks as if voting was a waste of time under such conditions, and the overwhelming majority would have a more expeditious way of teaching those capitalist hogs' manners.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Mr. J. P. Morgan's attempt to secure complete possession of the United States of America is gradually meeting with success. Having absorbed several more large independent mills and added them to his iron and steel octopus, he is now playing a great game to obtain control of the Republic Iron and Steel Co., a combine composed of a number of mills, and the big Jones & Laughlin Co., one of the Carnegie plant's foremost competitors. In fact, Morgan is playing two cards that seem hard to beat. One of Morgan's moves is through control of railways and the co-operation of friendly magnates. The independent concerns are in a measure bottled up, which is generally admitted, now that the Pennsylvania Co. blocked the scheme of the Wabash to gain an entrance into Pittsburg, which would have assisted the opponents of the United States Steel Corporation. The second move is the almost complete monopolization of the coke market. The Frick combine has announced that all the coke it produces will go to supply the Morgan mills, and as the Republic and Jones & Laughlin people have depended on Frick for their fuel, they have been hit a hard blow. It is rumored that the Jones & Laughlin interests are ready to sell out to the trust, and the prediction is also made that the Republic cannot hold out another year. Probably about the time Congress enacts a "stringent" anti-trust law Morgan will celebrate the event by taking over his remaining competitors and thus clinch his grip on the iron and steel production of the United States. "Competition is the life of trade," but Morgan don't believe it.

To finance new trusts and purchase independent mills, mines and railroads it is necessary to have some millions of ready capital always on hand. Much of the money needed is, of course, secured by pumping wind and water into the combines and selling it to would-be trust magnates, who anticipate dividends that are sweated from the hide of labor. But Morgan is not disposed to be satisfied with the old way of stock-jobbing and milking the public. He has learned that some of his iron and steel workers have made little savings over and above their living expenses. He wants those savings, and so an elaborate plan has been sprung on the employes by and through which they are to part with the few dollars they may have laid aside for the traditional rainy day and receive watered stock therefor and become great plutocrats. Besides getting rid of great volumes of water, Mr. Morgan hopes to strengthen United States Steel Corporation stock and send it nearer to par, and thus gain more of the outside public's confidence—

and its dollars. Secondly, the famous captain of industry expects to attach his labor to his machinery in much the same manner that the serfs were chained down to the land by the feudal barons. He reasons that when his "business partners," the toilers, own a few hundred dollars' worth of stock certificates with pretty gilt borders they will not only not want to go on strike against the corporation, but they will consent to be driven all the harder and produce more wealth than ever for "us." Then, again, the agitation against the present methods and ownership of trusts is growing. Nothing will be easier to disarm caustic criticism than to point with pride to the thousands of workers who are the "real thing" trust magnates and plutocrats. And who would have the heart to attack a great philanthropic corporation that was generously providing work for the workingman and wealth for all society, and providing a mite for the widow and orphan after the husband and father has killed himself in the mill? It is a great scheme, indeed, and the only thing the matter with it is that it don't seem to operate just right. The iron and steel workers apparently won't bite at the bait. News comes from the different iron centers that one union after another condemns the plan as one calculated to further rob and enslave them. It is true that the same band of blacklegs who scabbed in Chicago, Milwaukee and one or two other places are again displaying their "loyalty" to their masters to the extent of purchasing stock and announcing that they will organize a union (?) of their own, but the movement will not become general. The trust magnates, however, have a big trump card to play, and are already playing it, namely, they can shut down mills, especially during slack spells, where their workers are "disloyal" and refuse to hand over their savings to Morgan. They are enabled to do this because they control the tools of production by virtue of the votes of iron and steel and other workers, but it is quite likely that these same workers will learn the lesson of political solidarity and the truths of collective ownership and send men from their own ranks into the legislative halls, not to bust the trusts, but to take control of and run them.

Speaking of legislation, the capitalistic politicians at Washington are rubbing it in on labor this session, if they ever did. After lobbying, log rolling and pleading for a few crumbs since Congress met, capitalism has playfully tossed a few rocks. To show their contempt for organized labor, the politicians have taken its bills and instead of killing them outright twisted and amended them in such manner that they are more dangerous than if they were no laws. The Chinese exclusion law is now a pro-Chinese law, as has already been pointed out in the Review. The latest ruling made under this act is the decision of the Treasury Department, which declares in so many words that an American ship owner can hire all the coolies he desires in China, bring them to this country and transfer them to his other ships, and if the Philippine commission's recommendation goes through, contract Chinese labor will dominate the Pacific in a very short space of time. The anti-injunction bill is still sleeping in a Senate pigeon-hole, and union officials are praying that it will never wake up. But it may be forced through at almost any time, because it pleases cap-

italism. As introduced, it meant to outlaw the injunction as applied to labor in times of strikes; as amended, it legalizes the injunction sandbag. Another demand of the unions for a number of years was that a Department of Labor should be created. Some "workingmen's friends" in Washington, including labor leaders, so-called, thought that such a procedure would be "class legislation," and it was decided that the new Cabinet position should be a Department of Labor and Commerce. There was more fiddling, until finally the bill is reported without official recognition of labor—just a plain provision for a Department of Commerce. Not only is labor snubbed, but it is intended to take the present Bureau of Labor and jam it into an obscure corner of the new department and make it more capitalistic than ever, if such a thing is possible. But the worst treatment is that accorded the eight-hour bill, which has been constantly before Congress for over a generation. All through the present session the fight for and against the bill has been most bitter in the House and Senate committees. Ex-Secretary Hilary A. Herbert, Judge McCammon, the United States Steel Corporation, the Manufacturers' Association and other capitalistic interests struck blow after blow. The corporations denounced the bill especially as being "Socialistic," and after the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L. they charged the unionists with being Socialists, enemies of the government, American industry, and what not. Instead of meeting the attack and giving the trust tools to understand that the defeat of the eight-hour bill would mean more Socialists, the labor lobbyists apologized and practically crawled on their bellies. President Gompers is reported to have said at a session of the Senate committee: "We ask for legislation that is not revolutionary, but that shall be evolutionary in character, and that will constantly stand as a buttress against the risk of radical Socialism, which our friend, Ex-Secretary Herbert, has in mind. That is the constant stand which the advocates of this bill take." Mr. Gompers also assured the gentlemen that he opposes Socialism as emphatically as they do. The upshot was the report of the bill that is absolutely worthless. Eva McDonald Valesh, one of the editors of the American Federationist, writes as follows: "The eight-hour bill has been reported to the Senate from the Committee on Education and Labor with the heart cut out of it. Perhaps the case should be put more strongly. The bill is distinctly mischievous in character. As mentioned in a previous letter, it 'permits' a workman to spend as many hours as required on other work after working eight hours on government contract work. The eight-hour day is not to apply to work on transportation by sea or land. It may be declared off altogether in case of emergency, and the contractor is the judge of the 'emergency.' The fines for violation of the law are trifling and may be remitted by a government official. These are only samples of the things that the bill now contains. The government contractors are using all sorts of pressure to get it to a vote in the Senate, and believe it would go through the House, as the present House has no pre-election pledges to make, the next Congress having already been elected. Of course there is a pretense that the contractors are not desirous of the bill in its present shape. Why not? The amendments are all theirs. So far as organized labor is concerned, it is much better off

without an eight-hour law than to have such a travesty as this." The monstrosity may be forced through before this number of the Review is printed. But whether it is or not, the fact remains that the capitalistic politicians have nothing but contempt for organized labor, while our conservative "leaders," who seem to have a holy horror that the plutes are liable to become offended if the workers advocate Socialism, receive insults and kicks for their cowardice. Still, these results are educational. They prove that labor has nothing to expect from the trust-owned old parties, and that if the workers want concessions they must get into and help the Socialist party win its battle at the ballot box.

The investigation of conditions in the anthracite field has become a long-drawn-out affair. The stories of suffering told by the miners' witnesses caused a storm of indignation all over the country. Even the organs of the coal barons were speechless, but their opportunity came later on, when the imported scabs were placed on the witness stand and testified that there were assaults during the strike. The organs, including those that had professed friendship for the miners, immediately started a howl that the union approved of riots and refused to discipline and expel hot-headed members. This general denunciation also served the purpose of minimizing the condemnation of coal operators and dealers who pushed prices skyward while the thermometer was rushing toward zero. The scarcity of coal and the great suffering of the people was a deliberate attempt to "teach the public a lesson." In the Ohio convention of miners it was shown that the workers were kept idle two and three days a week, and in the anthracite field several thousand were on the blacklist. Baer and his organs claim railroads are unable to furnish cars, and at the same time hundreds of cars loaded with coal were kept standing on sidings near every city in the North. And while all this agitation was on dockages continued, and the Pennsylvania Co., for example, robbed the miners of \$4,000 worth of coal at one mine alone in December. The bituminous miners, finding that their bosses had advanced prices and aided in causing the famine, made a demand for a raise of 12½ per cent in wages, and it is not unlikely that another contest is brewing.

The union people of this country are speculating as to what effect the final decision in the celebrated Taff Vale railway case in England will have on the American situation. Because a strike was ordered and the union pickets interfered with scabs who sought to take their places the organization was mulcted out of \$40,000 damages. In this country a number of damage suits against unions are pending for boycotting and interfering with scabs, and if the British precedent is copied here, which is usually the case, another danger more serious than the injunction confronts us. The leading capitalist papers hailed the outcome of the Taff Vale trouble with satisfaction, and that is quite ominous. A little time will probably show where we stand.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Spirit of the Ghetto. By Hutchins Hapgood. Illustrated by Jacob Epstein. Funk & Wagnalls Co. Cloth, 312 pp. \$1.35.

Here we have again the story of the conflict between the "Old and the New," which ever forms the dominant note in books on modern Jewish life. It is the story of the disintegrating influence of capitalism upon religious rites, personal habits and social customs. The "colony of Russian and Galician Jews on the East Side" in New York now "form the largest Jewish city in the world." Here is to be found the poor and orthodox rabbi, who may be a great Talmudic scholar, deeply learned in Hebrew grammar and literature, but who is only a "green-horn" to the boy who has put on the smart ways of the outside world. This contrast leads to continuous tragedy, augmented by a bitter poverty, which is reflected in life, literature and on the stage. In the midst of this conflict the new spirit of Socialism is rising. The author of this book recognizes the all-pervading influence of Socialism. He finds it in the poetry, the drama, the woman movement and the press of the Ghetto. He has much to say of persons whose names are familiar to all Socialists—of Katz, Miller, Winchewesky and others. But, while he sees something of the tremendous influence of the Socialist movement on the life of the people of whom he is writing, he has caught no conception of Socialism itself, and it therefore appears to him as merely a peculiar transient phase of this one locality, and he says: "It is easy to see that the Ghetto boy's growing Americanism will be easily triumphant at once over the old traditions and the new Socialism." Indeed, the impress of superficiality is apparent on almost every page of the book. It is the work of a "clever" journalist who saw "good material" in the Ghetto, and who therefore put in some time in the restaurants, cafes and theaters, and in visiting and interviewing certain "characters." Then he selected a catchy title and obtained a talented young Jewish artist (himself a good "character"), who made some strikingly good pictures. This made some acceptable magazine articles, and it only remained to gather these into a book, and the deed was done. There is no denying the fact that the result is extremely readable and entertaining, but as a sociological study it can hardly take high rank.

The Conquest. By Eva Emery Dye. A. C. McClurg & Co. Cloth 444 pp. \$1.50.

The great American epic is to be found in the story of the conquest of the continent by the army of pioneers. Many have tried to write

this epic—some in the form of sober history, missing the poetry, romance and adventure, some in "historical novels" with more of fiction than of the facts that are greater than any fiction. This book is an effort to combine the two. Places, persons, events and dates are true to history and have been established with infinite research and study, but the style is that of the novelist. The story centers around George Rogers Clark and his brother William. It will some day be recognized that these two men played a more important part in the history of the United States than many whose names are much more familiar, for they conquered from the savage and from European aggression far greater possessions than did the men who served under Washington.

George Rogers Clark held back an army of savages larger than any composed of drilled troops that ever came to the Atlantic seaboard, and the battleground over which he fought was half a continent of untracked forest, with its strategic points in the hands of divisions of the same drilled armies that confronted Washington. The sufferings of the little army that took Vincennes may even throw in the shade the famous privations of the army at Valley Forge. For five days in February the band moving upon Vincennes waded or swam in the icy waters that covered the drowned lands of the Wabash, with only a few handfuls of parched corn as rations. A few years later came the expedition of Merriwether Lewis and William Clark up the Missouri and down the Columbia, three years of hardship, conflict and exploration beside which the achievements of a Stanley or a Livingston pale into insignificance. But the latter were opening up new fields immediately available as sources of profit, the former only blazing trails for an exploited proletariat fleeing from capitalism. Since capitalism has controlled our historians first honors have been given to those who were directly and highly valuable to capitalism. Miss Dye sees little or nothing of these facts in her writing, but she does quite faithfully describe the facts of social organization which have accompanied our frontier development, and she tells what she has to tell in a very interesting way.

Swords and Plowshares. By Ernest Crosby. Funk & Wagnalls. Cloth. 126 pp. \$1.00.

There is no doubt but what in striking at militarism one is striking at one of the fundamental props of capitalism. The tenderness of the ruling class on this point is shown by the hue and cry which has been raised by the action of the trade unions in antagonizing the militia and prohibiting its members from joining the volunteer army. In a country depending upon volunteer service it is only necessary to arouse a general public opinion to the effect that war is dishonorable to abolish the army. Certainly no one has done more in this direction than Ernest Crosby, and this little book of poems is mainly devoted to the same subject. The most of them are written in the meterless and rhymeless style of verse originated by Whitman, but the author has shown that he can handle conventional forms almost equally as well. There is always a keen humor in all that Mr. Crosby does, and we find it here in his satires of Rudyard Kipling, and also running through all the poems. The last half of the book is given up to poems on general

social subjects, one of the best being the little series on "Joy in Work." We shall hope at some future time to quote somewhat from this book for our readers, as it is one whose reading will delight all lovers of poetry or their fellow man.

The Coming City. By Richard T. Ely. T. Y. Crowell & Co. Cloth, 110 pp. 60 cents.

This is really but an expansion of a lecture which Dr. Ely has given repeatedly throughout the country during the past few years. It deals with the modern movement toward the city, and gives some valuable statistics of the growth of cities in the United States, and shows that this urban growth is not peculiar to America. He traces the origin of the urban movement to industrial causes, but does not make anything of an exhaustive analysis. The remainder of the work is largely a plea for some of the more commonly recognized municipal reforms. There is little or no recognition of the labor movement as a factor in municipal politics, and his "Coming City" would be but a gilded cage for the wage-worker. It will have some attractions to the sentimental dilettant reformer, but will fail to interest the actual essential social forces that are to be found in the working class alone.

Economic Tangles. By Judson Grenell. Purdy Publishing Co. Cloth, 220 pp. \$1.00.

These are a series of essays, reprints from articles published by the author in the Detroit News-Tribune, when he was on the editorial staff of that paper, and deal in a newsy, entertaining way with a large number of subjects, mostly of an economic nature. They are all written from what would ordinarily be considered as the "radical" point of view, generally friendly toward Socialism, but somewhat indefinite. The writer's sympathies as a whole, however, are very evidently with the Single Taxers, and it is from that point of view that most of the problems are treated. He is not, however, blind to the defects of that theory, and he concludes that "Socialism is marching to victory." There is a large amount of valuable information contained in the essays, in addition to their theoretical portion.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Subscription Post-Cards.

We are now ready to supply subscription post-cards, each good for a NEW yearly subscription to the International Socialist Review, on conditions which will be explained.

1. To anyone sending one dollar for any book or books published by us at advertised retail prices, we will, if requested at the time the money is sent, inclose a subscription post-card with the books. This offer will apply to larger orders also, a card being sent with each dollar's worth.

2. For the month of February only, the subscription post-cards will be sold for cash to anyone buying not less than four at a time, for 25 cents each.

3. To stockholders in the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company the cards will be sold at 25 cents each during the year 1903, and each stockholder may order not to exceed twenty cards at one time on credit, settlements to be made monthly for cards that have been sold.

These cards will not under any circumstances be accepted on the subscription of anyone who is or has been a subscriber, for 25 cents is far less than cost, and the object of the offer is to reach new readers who will probably subscribe at the regular rate after the first year. In the case of a subscriber inside the city of Chicago, or in any foreign country except Canada, Cuba and Mexico, 20 cents extra must be paid for postage when one of these cards is presented for a subscription.

The International Socialist Review does not aim directly to reach the millions of laborers who know nothing of Socialism and as little of the realities of capitalism. That indispensable work belongs to the weekly Socialist press and to our pamphlet literature, like the Pocket Library of Socialism. The work of the Review is, however, no less essential. It is to educate the educators.

First among these educators stand the workingmen who have come to a realizing sense of the truth of Socialism and who wish to make converts. They may have had no leisure for so-called higher education, but their firm grasp of the fundamental fact of the class struggle enables them to follow the discussions which the Review gives from month to month of the practical problems of the Socialist movement in the light of the Socialist philosophy, and from this reading they get a broader understanding of Socialism, which makes them more efficient workers, speakers and writers. The service thus rendered by the In-

ternational Socialist Review is absolutely unique. No local or propaganda sheet can undertake it without impairing its efficiency for its proper work, and if the Review were read only by these active Socialist workers its value to the movement would still be incalculable.

There is, however, a large and growing class to whom the Review is the best propaganda literature that can be offered. This class is the brain workers, the wage laborers who sell their heads instead of their hands, and who now in America, as already in Europe, are being forced by unpleasant facts beyond their control to realize that they are in the same slavery as the manual laborers, and that freedom can be won only through united effort. These men are trained thinkers, accustomed to dealing with general principles, and they are more attracted by the sober arguments of writers in the International Socialist Review than by appeals to their emotions or to their only nascent sense of class solidarity.

These are the ones whom we hope especially to reach by this new subscription post-card offer—the doctors, lawyers, editors, teachers and other well-educated but frequently ill-paid laborers. To these should be added the farmers who ten years ago were studying the question of national finance, in faulty text-books, true, but with an industry that shows they are not afraid of hard reading, and would readily understand articles that call for close attention, while on the other hand they would at first sight be repelled by just the style of argument that would soonest attract a trade unionist.

A dollar will send the Review one year to four such people. The best way to get the dollar is to induce one of the four to pay the full subscription price. This is a line of propaganda that should bring handsome returns.

Wanted—Addresses.

We propose to issue within a few months in booklet form a revised and correct list of the Socialist Party Locals in the United States, and we solicit the co-operation of State and local secretaries everywhere to make the list as complete as possible. There are many thousand unattached Socialists who would be glad to become active in the party, but are ignorant how to join it. Moreover, there are many new locals especially in States without a strong central organization, which are not getting the help they should get from outside, simply because the other comrades are ignorant of their existence. Anyone sending information of use in the preparation of this booklet will receive a number of copies for circulation when published.

A New Socialist Novel.

Comrade R. A. Dague, an active and energetic member of the Socialist Party Local at Alameda, Cal., has written and published a novel entitled "Henry Ashton," which will undoubtedly do good service in bringing Socialism to the attention of many who have as yet acquired no taste for more serious reading than fiction. The plot of his story is

one that will readily hold the reader's attention, and in his earlier pages he works in a number of interesting discussions between a Socialist and a non-Socialist, ending, naturally, with the conversion of the latter. His closing chapters picture the beginnings of a Socialist commonwealth on the island of Zanland, and the author's ideas in connection are suggestive, even though all Socialists might not indorse his details. The book is well bound in cloth, and the price is 75 cents; to our stockholders, 45 cents, postpaid.

Co-operation in Publishing Socialist Literature.

A booklet bearing this title has just been issued, and will be mailed to anyone requesting it. It describes in detail the plan of organization of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company. The number of stockholders as the booklet went to press was 570, located as follows:

Alabama	1	Maine	4	Pennsylvania	30
Alaska	2	Maryland	1	Rhode Island....	2
Arizona	8	Massachusetts ...	26	South Dakota....	1
Arkansas	1	Michigan	28	Tennessee	4
California	49	Minnesota	22	Texas	5
Colorado	20	Mississippi	1	Utah	6
Connecticut	9	Missouri	16	Virginia	2
Dist. Columbia...	6	Montana	12	Washington	17
Florida	8	Nebraska	8	West Virginia....	2
Georgia	3	New Hampshire..	6	Wisconsin	6
Idaho	7	New Jersey	5	Wyoming	3
Illinois	61	New Mexico	1	British Columbia.	6
Indiana	16	New York	46	Manitoba	1
Indian Territory.	1	North Carolina...	1	New Brunswick..	1
Iowa	23	North Dakota....	7	Ontario	7
Kansas	22	Ohio	22	Cuba	1
Kentucky	8	Oklahoma	10	Scotland	1
Louisiana	1	Oregon	11	Unknown	2
					<hr/>
					Total570

Even this large number does not show the real number of Socialists who have a voice in the control of the company, since no less than 79 shares are owned not by individuals, but by Locals of the Socialist Party. Moreover, the number of stockholders is increasing now faster than ever before. The number of shares authorized under the present charter is 1,000, and it will probably be necessary by midsummer to have the charter amended so as to admit of receiving 1,500 more shareholders.

In an ordinary company, organized for profit, it is likely to be a bad thing for small shareholders to increase the capitalization, since the dividend on each share might thus be diminished. Our company, however, is not organized to pay dividends, but to circulate Socialist literature. The benefit to each shareholder, apart from the knowledge

that he is helping the cause of Socialism, lies in the fact that he gets Socialist literature for a fraction of what it would otherwise cost him. Now the variety of this literature that can be offered depends on the amount of capital at the disposal of the company, so that each new share of stock subscribed is a direct benefit to every former stockholder. While on the other hand the new stockholder at once gets the benefit of all the capital previously subscribed.

This co-operative publishing house, like the Socialist movement to which it is attached, has now passed the hardest stage of slow beginnings and has entered upon a period of rapid growth. Its capital is still far from equal to its needs, but it is increasing at a rate that is more than encouraging. The demand for genuine Socialist literature was never so active as now. All that seems necessary is to let the people know where it is, and they are ready to send for it and pay for it. We are gradually increasing our advertising out of the ordinary receipts of the business, but if extraordinary expenditures could be made for this purpose there is little doubt but that the number of clear-headed Socialists in the United States could be doubled in a brief space of time. How we propose to raise the needed money and how to expend it will be found explained in the booklet. Send for it, read it, and act accordingly. Acknowledgments of the advertising fund will be made in later issues of the Review.

Kautsky's "The Social Revolution."

This important work, only lately published in Germany, and just published in our translation by A. M. and May Wood Simons, is already selling rapidly and winning general recognition as the most important Socialist work that has appeared for many a day. It is simple and clear in style, and will make an excellent propaganda work for general circulation, while it is at the same time a contribution to the discussion of Socialist party tactics that the most experienced worker in the Socialist movement cannot afford to miss. A full analysis of the book will be found in the editorial notice of the German edition, published in the International Socialist Review for November, 1902, pages 310-312. The book is published in the Standard Socialist Series, neatly bound in cloth, at 50 cents, with the usual discount to stockholders.

Frederick Engels on Feuerbach.

An important work of Engels, though scarcely known to American readers, is his criticism on the philosophical writings of Feuerbach, a man of considerable prominence in Germany forty years ago, though now generally forgotten. Feuerbach rejected the dogmas of the church, and announced himself a Socialist, but he attempted to carry over into Socialism a mass of mystical vagaries devoid of any rational basis. His ideas won a certain amount of popularity among unthinking people, precisely as similar ideas under various names have their followers to-day. Engels took the trouble to give this philosophy a serious answer, and the answer makes good reading to-day. Austin

Lewis has made an admirable translation, with an explanatory introduction, and "Feuerbach" will appear early in March as the eighth number of the Standard Socialist Series.

Socialism Utopian and Scientific.

This classic of Socialism was first offered to American readers by our co-operative company in the standard translation by Edward Aveling about two years ago. The edition of five thousand copies has now been exhausted and a new edition has just been published. The new cloth edition is printed on heavy laid paper with wide margins, and is bound in extra silk cloth, uniform with other books in the Standard Socialist Series, of which this is the seventh volume. The price is fifty cents, with the usual discount to stockholders. The paper edition will be in the convenient pocket size as before, and will sell at ten cents.

New Numbers of the Pocket Library.

"Socialists in French Municipalities," number 16 of the Pocket Library of Socialism, which has been out of print some months, has now been re-issued with an added appendix by A. M. Simons on "Some Suggested Municipal Programs." Kropotkin's "Appeal to the Young," in the excellent translation by H. M. Hyndman, has just been published as number 36 of the Pocket Library. A full set of the 36 numbers will be mailed for \$1.00, single numbers five cents each. Stockholders in our co-operative company get single numbers for two cents each, or 100 for \$1.00, postage included. By express to stockholders \$8.00 a thousand, \$35.00 for 5,000. Nothing else quite so good for propaganda as these little red-covered booklets. Try them in your town and watch the vote.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.


Books of Scientific

ALLEN, Henry E. A Study in Government.....	\$.05	—R
AVELING, Edward. The Student's Marx..	1.00	—W
BELLAMY, Edward. Plutocracy or Nationalism, Which?.....	.05	MARX & ENGELS
BADEN-POWELL, B. H. Village Communities in India.....	1.00	—T
BAX, E. Belfort. The Ethics of Socialism..	1.00	MACHIN
—Outlooks from the New Standpoint...	1.00	Lab
—Story of the French Revolution.....	1.00	MASSARI
—The Religion of Socialism.....	1.00	Org
BERNSTEIN, Edward. Ferdinand Lassalle.	1.00	MAYNA
BLATCHFORD, Rob't. Britain for the British.	.50	MILLER
—The same in paper.....	.25	Soci
—Imprudent Marriages.....	.05	MORRIS
—Merrie England.....	.10	cial
BLISS, H. L. Plutocracy's Statistics.....	.10	MORRIS
BOUROFF, Basil. The Impending Crisis...	.35	and
BROOME, Isaac. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.....	.50	NEWSP.
BROWN, W. I. Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo XIII.....	.02	Whi
BROWN, Wm. T. After Capitalism, What..	.05	NOYER
—The Real Religion of Today.....	.05	Stri
—The Axe at the Root.....	.05	PRESIN
—The Relation of Religion to Social Ethics.....	.05	—T
CARPENTER, Edward. England's Ideal....	1.00	—T
—Civilization, Its Cause and Cure.....	1.00	ROBERT
—Love's Coming-of-Age.....	1.00	—T
CORRY, W. A. How I Acquired My Millions	.05	ROBERT
DARROW, Clarence S. Crime and Criminals	.10	CRIM
—In Memory of John P. Altgeld.....	.05	ROBERT
—Realism in Literature and Art.....	.05	SCHAEF
—Resist Not Evil.....	.75	cial
DAWSON, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism.....	1.00	SIMONS
—German Socialism and Lassalle.....	1.00	—T
ENGELS, Frederick. Condition of the English Working Class in 1844.....	1.25	—T
—The Origin of the Family.....	.50	—W
—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific....	.50	Wot
—The same in paper.....	.10	—S
HERRON, Geo. D. Why I Am a Socialist...	.05	—T
HINDS, Wm. A. American Communities..	1.00	—W
KAUTSKY, Karl. Life of Frederick Engels	.10	—T
—The Social Revolution.....	.50	SIMONS
KELLEY, J. W. Industrial Democracy.....	.05	Pro
KERR, Charles H. Morals and Socialism..	.05	SOCIALI
—The Folly of Being "Good".....	.05	SOMER
—(Compiler) Socialist Songs.....	.05	cial
—Socialist Songs with Music.....	.20	TWININ
KERR, May Walden. Socialism and the Home.....	.05	VAIL, C
LA FARGUE, Paul. The Evolution of Property.....	1.00	—T
—Socialism and the Intellectuals.....	.05	VANDE
LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm. No Compromise..	.10	Ind
—Memoirs of Karl Marx.....	.50	—T
—Socialism, What it is, and What it Seeks to Accomplish.....	.10	WATER
LODIA, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society.....	1.25	WENTW
MACKAY, H. W. Boyd. A Sketch of Social Evolution.....	.05	Inte
MCDILL, J. T. Let's All Get Rich.....	.02	WILSH
MARX, Karl. Capital. Cloth, 817 pages...	2.00	perl

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, edited which every well-informed socialist finds an absolute necessity. It is the recognition of the most vital questions of party policy.

SPECIAL OFFER. For one dollar we will send to one year to a new subscriber (one who has never been a subscriber) a book or books from the above list to the amount of one dollar.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

MARCH, 1903.

NO. 9.

The Industrial Development of the South.*

IN a late issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW you have probably noticed the article by Geo. W. Rives, "A Short Cut." In this article the idea is put forth that we are much too slow in approaching the time of realization of the co-operative society, and that concentration of Socialist energy, propaganda and even money upon some limited territory might accelerate the advent of Socialism in that particular territory. The very fact that the editor of this monthly found it necessary to insert this article in order to refute the feasibility of this plan, is strong evidence how little the true philosophy of evolutionary Socialism has been assimilated in this country. Throw a stronger light upon this new plan of Mr. Rives', and you will not fail to recognize the old familiar face of pure utopian Socialism in it. Consider how closely it approaches the scheme of colonization of a western state with Socialists that so much was spoken and thought of in 1897. Whoever has made a careful study of scientific Socialism, knows that it proposes not a reform but a complete social revolution, a complete overthrow of modern society with all its forms of industrial organization—a change that, because of its magnitude, cannot be local, but must embrace pretty much the whole of our industrial society.

Whether a complete socialization of all the industrial countries of all the five continents will be necessary, we do not undertake to say. But one thing is certain: Take any one of the greater political units of the earth, like United States, Russia or Germany, and no matter how different the economic condition of different sections of the country, you cannot have Socialism in one part of the country and capitalism in the other. And yet we all agree that Socialism is an economic growth, and we all know what dif-

*A lecture delivered before the New York Russian Social Democratic Society, Dec. 21, 1902.

ferent stages of economic development may be found in the different sections of any one of the greater countries.

A small state like Belgium may move smoothly along the path of industrial life; a small state like Roumania may be all agricultural and backward. But compare the kingdom of Saxony with the province of Posen in Germany, or the district of Moscow, full of factories and mills, with the district of Tambov, where agriculture is all and industry next to nothing, and you will readily see that our European comrades have, or will have, difficulties to overcome, which very clearly resemble the difficulty of the Southern question. Look through the tables of the tremendous vote our party received this fall, and how is the showing of the South. In fact, so serious are those difficulties presented by the backwardness and stagnation of large divisions of the country, that to many they seemed to be insurmountable obstacles. To disprove this last view, at least in regard to the situation in our own country, to indicate the hopeful signs of a new industrial life in the stagnating South—to prove the existence of these favorable symptoms beyond the possibility of a shadow of a doubt—such are the purposes of this short sketch.

We shall not go into any historic philosophical speculations as to the causes of the great Civil War. It is certain, however, that an industrial revolution throughout the United States was the result. "With the Civil War there began a new industrial era not only on account of the expansion of mechanical industries . . . but on account of the wonderful change in the system of labor which prevailed in a large part of the country."* Wright speaks of the system of sale of free labor, a system which is not only wonderful but admirable from the capitalist point of view.

Let us draw a short pen picture of the life of the South before the Civil War. In its main features it is a feudal system. Population is divided into three main classes: (1) the slave owners, the white barons; (2) the slaves, and (3) the "white trash" who hang on to the rich slave owners. These lived on their estates, very much in the fashion of the Russian nobleman before the liberation of the serfs. The towns were markets, whither the rich planters went from time to time for purchases and a gay time. The rich slave-owning class cultivated the same virtues, which counted for so much among the mediaeval feudal barons. Up to this time the Southern gentleman imitates the knight of the fifteenth century in his manner towards ladies, and the ladies are as graceful and charming as the heroines of Walter Scott. The ideal of the new, free, independent woman does not as yet exist in the South.

Because of the peculiarities of the rich soil, the rich plantation

*Carroll D. Wright. *Industrial Evolution of the United States*. P. 178.

owners grew only a limited number of useful plants, and were therefore forced to carry on a large foreign trade. All their cotton or sugarcane went North or was exported. "The fashion of the South has been to consider the production of cotton and sugar and rice the only rational pursuits of gentlemen, except the professions, and, like the haughty Greek and Roman, to class the trading and manufacturing spirit as essentially servile," a Southern journalist wrote in 1852. The view that the condition of industry in the ancient world was caused by the contempt felt towards it, is extremely naive, of course. For the truth is just the reverse of it; the contempt was caused by its primitive condition. Yet the modern American writer, to whom we are obliged for this interesting quotation, substitutes for it another explanation which is not worth much more: "A more correct statement is that manufactures and commerce had been retarded in the South because one class, limited in number and representing only about one-fourth of the white population, has for various reasons preferred a plantation civilization to any other."* In short, there was no industry, because for many reasons there was none. But what were these many reasons? Development of manufacturing industry presupposes free labor power, which did not exist in the South at that period of its history. On the other hand, all the Southern capital that existed was naturally attracted towards slave-owning as a very profitable business.

The vast majority, then, of the natural products of the South supplied distant mills. Here and there some small industrial establishments sprang forth—mainly in the line of cotton industry, but they had to utilize negro labor, slave labor, which did not seem at all to suit the requirements of industrial work. No capital came from the North, partly because of political reasons, partly because even the North did not possess at that time any surplus of capital, and partly because the main attraction for capital did not exist in the South, a plentiful supply of free labor. "Cheapness of cotton, abundance of water power, the resources of the coal fields, when steam began to supplant the dam, the other mineral resources, and the wealth of forests of pine, live oak, cypress and others, from other parts sufficient capital to develop the section to anything like its full extent" (p. 73).

Southern manufacture, therefore, consisted in this period mainly of production for the immediate, surrounding market for the satisfaction of the local demand. The first stage of cotton manufactures—cotton growing, was almost the only one considerable form of industry, that grew, because of the enormous economy of doing this work right at the place of the cotton plantation.

*Southern Sidelights. By Edward Ingle, A. B. N. Y., 1896. (Library of Economics and Politics, edited by R. T. Ely, M. D.)

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the South was a rich country, if we give this phrase its ordinary vulgar interpretation. In 1890, the editor of a Baltimore publication, the *Manufacturers' Record*, Mr. Edmonds, published a pamphlet, "The Redemption of the South from Poverty to Wealth," and he gave his work the following sub-title: "In 1860 the Richest Part of the Country. In 1870 the Poorest. In 1880 Signs of Improvement. In 1889 Regaining the Position of 1860." So you see that the South before the Civil War was not only a rich, but the richest country. But the catastrophe of 1861-65 shook the very foundation of this prosperity. The sudden transformation of millions of human beings, representing thousands of millions of property, into so many proletarians in the very worst sense of the term—people without property, and without visible means of support—this sudden transformation alone was sufficient to change the South from the richest into the poorest part of the Union. But even disregarding this sudden metamorphosis the Civil War could not but have a destructive influence upon the economic well-being of the South. The millions which the unequal struggle cost, destruction of buildings, neglect of farms and plantations, hundreds of thousands of workers lost—all this destroyed the prosperity of this once rich country for many years to come.

The first years of Reconstruction were, therefore, sad years indeed. Yet this sad condition of affairs could not last indefinitely. The South now had no organic obstacle to the development of capitalistic production. Besides the enormous supply of free negro labor, which was the direct result of emancipation, the impoverishment of the slave-holding magnates, and the still greater impoverishment of the white "trash," laid foundation to a white proletariat. The negro for many years remained fit for agricultural work only; this white proletariat however immediately formed excellent material for factory production. The natural resources of the South are in no respect poorer than those of the North. The rich soil, which is the best in the world for cultivation of cotton, tobacco, sugar cane, rice, etc., is in itself sufficient as a foundation for industrial activity. But the South has, in addition, coal mines and iron ore, and coal and iron have always been and are now the parents of all large industry. If these two conditions, a plentiful supply of free labor and natural resources, are all sufficient for a gradual development of capitalist industry, a flow of capital from outside is necessary for the quickening of the process, and such capital did not fail to appear.

Northern capital was destined to perform the same service for the South, which German, French and Belgian capital performs at present for Russia. It took a few decades before this influence could show itself. It's true, Edmonds, whom we have

already quoted, claimed that in 1889 the South has regained the position she held in 1860, that of the richest section of the country; but this of course is an enormous exaggeration. Even now the South is undoubtedly the poorest section of the United States. Northern capital began to appear in the South very gradually, indeed. Up to the '80s even the North did not possess any superfluous capital that could not be placed profitably in the immediate locality, and, besides, the naturally strained relations between the North and the South could not but be a freezing influence. Only in the second half of the '90s, when the phenomenal growth of Northern industries, the rise of profits because of the process of consolidation, and the rapid formation of enormous private capitals, caused in the North the rather unusual experience of free capital seeking profitable employment, when American capital began to migrate to the West Indies, the East Indies, the Orient, and even to England and the continent—when the Spanish-American war, with its sudden outburst of maudlin "patriotism," had "reconciliated" the North and South, then, I say, Northern capital had to go Southward. Soon other factors appeared, which directed to the South not only Northern capital, but also Northern industry. The South, it was said, began to compete with the North. In reality, however, Southern labor competed with Northern labor. Behind both stood the same Northern capitalist. Unfortunately there are no reliable statistics as to the extent of the migration of Northern capital and Northern enterprises towards the South, yet, as we will see later, at least in one industry, this process can be somewhat studied. This is the cotton industry.

Let us first look at the growth of Southern industry in its entirety. Whichever symptom of industrial growth we might take, we always come to the same conclusion, that the South is rapidly approaching the North, by exhibiting a higher co-efficient of growth. The distance between the North and South on the road of industrial development is enormous, but still more significant is the fact that this distance is rapidly becoming smaller.

Let us look at the growth of capital in manufacturing establishments, and we find the following data, always comparing the whole United States with the South:

	In million dollars.		Per cent of increase in ten years.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	2,118	139
1880	7,780	193	31.7	38.7
1890	6,525	510	13.39	164.7
1900	9,817	953	50.9	86.7

Compare the last two columns and you can read an eloquent story out of them, if you notice how much larger the per cent of increase is for the South than for the whole United States. Should we, instead of the United States, compare the South with the North, the results would undoubtedly be still more striking; but in the form in which we present them the statistical data are convincing enough, as they prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the Southern industrial capital is growing more rapidly than the Northern.

Within thirty years the capital in manufactures of the entire United States has increased by 363 per cent and the Southern manufacturing capital 585.6 per cent. Looking upon it in a somewhat different view now, we find that in 1870 the South's share of the manufacturing capital was 6.6 per cent, in 1890 6.9 per cent, in 1890 7.8 per cent, and in 1900 9.7 per cent.

Now we will take the value of products as the basis of our comparison, and we naturally arrive at the same results:

	In million dollars.		Per cent of increase by decades.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	4,232	279	...	22.0
1880	5,369	338	26.9	22.0
1890	9,372	706	74.5	108.6
1900	13,039	1,184	39.1	67.6

In thirty years the value of the products of manufactures of the United States increased by 208 per cent, and the value of products of the Southern manufactures 327.4 per cent. In 1870 the South's share was 6.6 per cent, in 1900 9.1 per cent.

And still more important are the data relative to the growth of wage-earners, as here we get a glimpse of information concerning the growth of the laboring class:

	In thousands.		Per cent of increase by decades.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	2,054	186
1880	2,783	223	33.0	19.8
1890	4,257	412	56.6	84.4
1900	5,321	656	25.2	59.8

Within thirty years the number of workingmen in manufacturing industries of the United States increased 157.5 per cent, but in the South the number of workingmen increased 252.7 per cent. In 1870, therefore, 9.1 per cent of the workingmen were in the South, and in 1900 12.3 per cent!

Within these thirty years the population of the United States increased from 38.5 millions to 76.3 millions, or almost 100 per cent,

and the population of the Southern States from 124 millions to 252, or 105 per cent. The number of wage-earners in the manufacturing industries only was, in 1870, 5.3 per cent of the whole population of the United States; in the South however it amounted only to 1.5 per cent. In 1900 the workers in manufactures constituted 7 per cent of the population, and in the South 2.5 per cent. Let us call the proportion of workers in manufactures to the population of the United States 100, then the competitive proportion in the South would be equal to 28.3 in 1870 and 35.7 in 1900. Such is the mathematical expression of the industrial growth of the South.

When we turn to the growth of the number of manufacturing establishments, however, the most natural indicator of the growth of industry where industrial life is in its beginning, we find the following: In the United States the number of manufacturing establishments increased 44.3 per cent in the last twenty years, and in the Southern States by 81.4 per cent.

While in the entire United States the average capital per establishment increased from \$18,300 in 1890 to \$19,200; and in New England it increased from \$243.20 to \$275.10; in the Middle States it increased from \$204.00 to \$246.40; in the Southern States, on the contrary, it was \$110.00 in 1890, and \$113.20 in 1900, i. e., remained almost the same. This was to be expected. Where capitalistic production is in its primary stages, where capital is scanty, labor cheap and the rate of profits and interests high, there even to the smallest capitalist a large field of activity is open. Yet even here we see the advantages of the young, industrial region, which evidently can live through all the necessary stages in a much shorter time, for the South is already acquainted, and to an appreciable extent with the phenomena of industrial consolidation and concentration. We need but mention the whisky trust, the tobacco trust, and the creation of the last weeks, the consolidation of the Southern cotton factories.

Though we wish to refrain from details concerning separate industries, yet we think it absolutely necessary to say a few words about the development of the cotton industry in the South, for here we find an eloquent illustration of the relations between the Northern and Southern industry, and of the role the South is destined to play in the future economic development of the United States. For the last thirty years the cotton industry grew, by decades, in the following manner:*

	1870-1880.	1880-1890.	1890-1900.
United States . . .	5.8 per cent.	28.9 per cent.	7.8 per cent.
New England . . .	14.7 per cent.	26.3 per cent.	5.8 per cent.
South	43.8 per cent.	153.8 per cent.	128.8 per cent.

*Twelfth Census, Vol. VII., p. CLXXVII.

Compare but the last two lines and you have the whole story of the development of the cotton industry in a nutshell.

In 1890 the South had 239 factories, with a capital of 53 millions, 36,000 workingmen and a value of products that amounted to 41.5 millions. In 1900, 401 factories, capital 124 millions, number of workingmen 97,500, and value of products 95 million dollars. It is positively known that several factories have preferred to move to the South because of the, there, more profitable conditions of production. Northern capital was more mobile than Northern factories, and moved thither more freely. Our esteemed Mayor, Seth Low, is not the only one to derive his means to do charity in the North from the Southern cotton factories.

What is so plain and evident in regard to manufacture of cotton goods, is, or will be, true of other goods as well, as, for instance, of tobacco manufacture. In the very near future we can expect a veritable exodus to the South of various factories and mills, which will find the Southern atmosphere, notwithstanding its heat and yellow fever, more congenial to them. What are the advantages of the South?

The most powerful arguments in support of his theories the Socialist often borrows from the capitalist writers. A few years ago that extremely capitalist paper, the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, sent its special representative to the Southern States to investigate the question of the South's advantages for the manufacture of cotton goods. In one of his letters this special envoy of capitalism writes that "a special committee of the Arkwright Club of Boston visited the South in 1897 and, after investigation of the textile industry there, presented a report setting forth the advantages which it considered the South had over the North in the manufacture of cotton goods. These advantages were, it declared, so great as to make competition on the part of New England a losing business. It grouped them chiefly under four heads, as follows:

"I. That cotton is conveniently near to the Southern mills and freight on it can be saved.

II. That water power is abundant and that coal is cheap if you prefer to run by steam.

II. That labor is abundant and cheap and not inclined to organize against employers; and

IV. That the enactment of labor laws is not likely to trouble employers for many years."

The correspondent goes on to examine critically these four claims. As to savings on freight, because of the raw material being near, he finds that this advantage has been greatly overestimated. Cotton growing is spreading westward now, and

Texas is the main supply. Cotton manufacturing in the South is concentrating in the Southeast, in South and North Carolina, where new factories are built, though the production of raw cotton has reached its limits. Besides, what Southern mills gain in freight or raw material is largely offset by the cost of getting their manufactured goods to the market. As to water power, modern manufacturers give it up in favor of steam power. However, he acknowledges that "wages are lower, hours of labor longer." And though he sees the coming danger of labor movements, unions and labor legislation, yet he says "it must at least be many years before it (Southern labor) loses its present distinctive and admirable characteristics." Admirable, indeed. We shall learn a little more of these characteristics presently. Meanwhile we will quote a little table, which the correspondent has made up as a result of his personal observations, in regard to the wages in the Southern cotton mills. The following munificent salaries are paid per day to the "free and independent" adult male workers:

	North Carolina.	South Carolina.	Georgia.	Alabama.
Carders' pay	\$0.95	\$0.90	\$0.95	\$0.80
Speeders' pay77	.80	.92	.83
Spoolers' pay77	.80	.90	.65
Spinners' pay68	.63	.80	.58
Weavers' pay90	.95	1.05	.95

This, remember is for eleven and often for twelve and even thirteen hours of work.

In another of his letters the same correspondent speaks of the first efforts of introducing negro labor into the textile factories. Here we touch upon an exceedingly interesting feature of the economic development of the South for the last years. The negro, who, for generations was considered capable of agricultural labor only, is being transformed into a factory workman. The Socialist can only rejoice at this, for here we find a tendency, whose ultimate work will be a final solution of the negro question. As it often happens, our enemy, the capitalist, is here our main ally. Only consider what will happen to the South, when the negro will prove fit not only for textile but for all other factories, and as a necessary corollary will prove susceptible to labor union and Socialist propaganda.

Meanwhile, however, negro labor will attract the capitalist not only by its cheapness, but also by its submission to the extremest degrees of exploitation. The following conversation between our correspondent and a certain Mr. Thurston, superintendent of a silk mill owned by Ashley & Bailey Company (a

firm, by the way, that has silk mills at Paterson, N. J., and in Pennsylvania, and can therefore very well judge of the difference of Southern and Northern profits) at Fayetteville, N. C., certainly deserves to be immortalized. Mr. Thurston, the correspondent says, puts his views in the following form:

"It is a mistake to believe that the negro has not enough manual dexterity to make him a successful worker in the textile field. All our help here has been trained from the start and within a year we have made as good an average of capable workers as if we had been training white help. But no one will make a success of a mill by applying white methods to the colored people, with the latter there is but one rule to follow, that of the strictest discipline. Call it military despotism, if you will. There are no indulgences in this mill; kindness would be construed as weakness and advantage taken of it to the detriment of our work. Faults and irregularities are severely punished."

"'By fines, I suppose,' the correspondent suggested.

"No, sir, by whipping."

"'But doesn't that only apply to the smaller boys?'

"No, it applies to the larger ones, too."

"'Do you whip the girls?'

"Yes, the girls are whipped, too; but one whipping is generally enough for the bigger girls; they are so much ashamed that a second whipping is seldom needed."

"'By whipping do you mean a light chastisement?'

"The punishment is not light, it is severe; anything else would be a waste of time. It is upon this system that we have to rely to secure a proper performance of duty. All the help engaged here under twenty-one years of age are put absolutely under my control from 6 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock at night, and I am free from responsibility as to the course I pursue towards them during that time."

Admirable, isn't it?

You must notice, that here we have been in the silk industry. The cotton industry is not the only one which pays better in the South than in the North. It is not a specific but a very general phenomenon with which we are now dealing. I hope you will excuse me for introducing here a few more statistical data which will demonstrate the comparative cheapness of Southern labor power:

The average yearly earnings of an adult male workingman were as follows:*

	1890.	1900.
Entire United States	\$498.71	\$490.90
New England	509.33	507.12

*Twelfth Census, Vol. VII., p. CX V., etc.

	1890.	1900.
Middle States	540.62	528.71
Central States	470.84	488.51
Western States	565.91	577.09
Pacific States	620.39	577.11
Southern States	364.83	334.96

Not only are the wages the very lowest in the South, but they have fallen within the last ten years, and fallen more than in many other sections. In some States the yearly earnings are still lower, as for instance in Alabama \$309.10, in Georgia, \$264.24, in North Carolina \$235.20, and in South Carolina \$232.08, or a little more than \$4.50 a week. The female worker in the South has a still more precarious existence:

	1890.	1900.
Entire United States	\$267.97	\$273.03
New England	293.43	307.34
Middle States	273.19	280.75
Central States	237.42	249.45
Western States	267.78	273.48
Pacific States	288.61	278.09
Southern States	193.03	183.91

The average earnings of the Southern woman wage-worker have fallen, notwithstanding the general rise in the wages of women. While the man's earnings in the South represent 68.2 per cent of the average earnings of a worker throughout the United States in 1900, the Southern women's yearly earnings equal only 67.3 per cent. In Alabama the average earnings fall to \$180.63, in South Carolina to \$172.80, in Virginia to \$161.02, and in North Carolina to 153.06, just \$3 a week.

Children's labor is paid at a correspondingly low rate:

	1890.	1900.
The entire United States	\$137.53	\$152.22
New England	158.07	187.15
Middle States	146.22	159.52
Central States	138.61	166.21
Western States	116.99	175.07
Pacific States	169.30	181.62
Southern States	99.34	107.20

These earnings fall to \$101.57 in Alabama, \$99.23 in South Carolina, and \$96.01 in North Carolina. Yet the wages of children rose somewhat, even in the South, because of the enormous increase in the demand for it.

Yes, the Southern factory asks for child's labor, looks for it,

and is even willing to increase the pay for it somewhat; for how easy it is to exploit the poor mites to the very last degree of human endurance.

Child labor is one of the most characteristic features of the early stages of capitalistic development, and we are therefore prepared to find it in the South developed to a high degree. However unreliable the statistical data in regard to this question, they are nevertheless very eloquent. In the entire United States there were in 1900 in the manufactures, 168,583 children;* out of those 43,038 children, or 25.5 per cent, were in the South. The significance of this proportion will become clear, if we remember that out of the entire number of industrial workers only 12.9 per cent fell to the share of the South, which, therefore, has proportionately twice as many children in factories as the rest of the country. In the United States children constituted 3.2 per cent of the number of workingmen; in the Southern States, however, 6.6 per cent. In the Central States, with their highly developed manufactures, only 2.3 per cent of the workingmen were children; in the Western States only 2.1 per cent, and in the Pacific States only 1.9 per cent. Still more significant is the fact that child labor is on the increase in the South, while in all the other sections of the country, with its much more advanced industries, child labor is gradually disappearing. If we take the period of twenty years, from 1880 to 1900, the number of children under 16 years employed in New England diminished from 41,306 to 25,187; in the Middle States diminished from 79,118 to 61,225; in the Central States diminished from 39,115 to 33,974; in the Southern States increased from 19,639 to 43,038.

As the general industrial progress has as yet invaded only certain of the Southern States, so this phase of it—child labor—has become a great deal more prominent in some States than in others, namely, in Alabama, Georgia, in North and South Carolina.

Number of children in manufactures.			
	1880.	1890.	1900.
Alabama	809	1,425	3,474
Georgia	2,319	3,521	6,373
North Carolina	2,352	4,733	10,377
South Carolina	1,118	2,309	8,560

Children constituted in 1900 6.5 per cent of all industrial workingmen in Alabama, 7.6 per cent in Georgia, 14.7 per cent in North Carolina, and 17.7 per cent in South Carolina! These dry statistical tables do not, however, give an adequate idea of the serious condition of affairs. We must keep in mind the fact that

*Census Reports, Vol. VII., p. CXXVIII.

these statistical data are far from being accurate; this information was obtained through agents from owners of factories, who certainly made an effort to minimize the sadness of the picture, even granting the (questionable) willingness to be as conscientious and truthful as possible, the broad limits of classification made mistakes inevitable, and mistakes in one direction—that of counting children among the adults. And for this reason, according to the census regulation, only workmen below 16 are counted as children; and where factories are crowded with tots 10, 9, and even 8 and 7 years old, there a 15-year-old lad or girl will very often be considered a grown-up person. These qualifications are not invented by us; they are put forth by the official census statistician (Vol. VII., p. cxxv.).

A short time ago the "great, fair-minded American press" has turned its "searchlight" upon this evil; but, we must not forget, it took a small labor paper to start the ball rolling, to point out to the Northern press what was going on in the Southern factories. With the articles of Mrs. Irene Ashley-Macfayden, in *The American Federationist*, the reader is undoubtedly familiar, and I need not tire him with lengthy quotations from it; you all remember "the little boy, in Alabama, who worked for forty nights in succession," and "another child 6 years old, who had been on the night shift eleven months, the description of the accidents and diseases that befell the little industrial slaves.

As you well know, the Southern cotton factories are the main employers of child labor. But few of you imagine to what an extent this labor is used. Here again a few statistical data may prove convincing, if not interesting. In 1870 there were 2,343 children in the Southern cotton factories; in 1880, 4,098; in 1890, 8,815; in 1900, 24,459, out of a total number of 97,559 workingmen, or more than 25 per cent. During these thirty years the number of children in the cotton factories of New England diminished from 14.5 per cent to 6.7 per cent, in the Middle States from 22.0 per cent to 12.0 per cent, in the Western States from 31.1 per cent to 9.0 per cent. In the South more than one-fourth of all workers in cotton factories are children, in South Carolina the proportion rises to 26.8 per cent, and in Alabama to 29.2 per cent. There you have at least one powerful cause of the migration of the cotton factories into the Southern States. And what are the conditions of life and work for these little victims? Mrs. Macfayden's statements may be prejudiced, you know, for she writes for a labor paper. Let us turn to the highly respectable bourgeois publication, *The Dry Goods Economist*, which had a special representative make a thorough investigation of this matter. The result of this investigation was summed up as follows:

"First, that one tenth to one-fifth of the total number of cotton operators are mere children.*

"Second, that they work from eleven to twelve hours a day.

"Third, that they are paid from 10 to 50 cents a day.

"Fourth, that boys and girls from 14 to 18 make from 50 to 75 cents a day.

"Fifth, that adults rarely make over a dollar a day, and that on piece work.

"Sixth, that the children's work, though not heavy, is grinding and nerve-racking.

"Seventh, that the constant buzz of whirring wheels, the high temperature, and vitiated air, conditions inseparable from cotton mills, wear down the stoutest frame and strongest nerves, and the children so employed ere long lose the bright eye, healthy glow, and elastic step which is the common heritage of youth.

"Eighth, that in many cases these urchins are held in hopeless bondage to their illiterate, heartless and avaricious parents.

"Ninth, that the normal order of things is, alas! too often inverted, and the saddening spectacle presented of weak children supporting able-bodied parents, in lieu of parents supporting their offspring.

"Tenth, that not one out of twenty of such toilers can read or write."

As was to be expected, of course, the bourgeois reporter makes an asinine effort (in his eighth and ninth statements) to throw the odium of child labor on heartless parents, but the effort is worthless in the eyes of any serious economist, and the effectiveness of the general statement not in the least impaired by it. Elbert Hubbard, that eloquent and original journalist, puts into powerful expressions what we all undoubtedly feel when he exclaims in "The Philistine:"

"I know the sweatshops of Hester street, New York. I am familiar with the vice, depravity and degradation of the White-chapel district; I have visited the Ghetto of Venice; I know the lot of coal miners of Pennsylvania, and I know somewhat of Siberian atrocities; but for misery, woe, and hopeless suffering, I have never seen anything to equal the cotton mill slavery of South Carolina—this is my own America, the land of the free and the home of the brave!"

And yet, * * * this condition of affairs has not even the virtue of originality. History repeats itself, of course. And while you read the above lines, haven't you all thought of the tenth chapter of the first volume of Marx's Capital, entitled "The Working Day?"

*We do not know what the writer means by "mere children," but we have shown above that not 1-10—1-5, but 1-4—1-3 of all cotton operatives are, according to the census, below 16 years of age.

One of the necessary conditions of such extensive and also intensive exploitation of little children in the factories of the South is to be found in the scantiness (we might say absence) of any bona fide labor legislation.

None of the States or Territories of our republic need be very proud of its labor legislation, that's true; still the condition of affairs in the South is infinitely worse than in the North. Let us look upon this one question of regulation of hours of labor. Out of forty-eight States and Territories twenty-one have absolutely no legal limitations of the working day, even of women and children. Out of those twenty-one, ten are Southern States. Out of the fifteen States that constitute the American South, as many as ten (North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, West Virginia, Mississippi, Texas and Arkansas) allow full freedom of exploitation of women's and children's work. But the remaining five States are not in a much better position. In Louisiana sixty hours a week are the limits of work for women and children. The same law applies to Virginia, but here 14 years is defined as the limit of childhood. What a kind provision of legislation to limit the work of children under 14 to ten hours a day, Saturdays not excluded. In South Carolina and Georgia the legal working day for women and children is eleven hours a day, or 66 hours a week.

At what age may children be admitted to factory work? In New York the law puts the limit at 14, and though the execution of this law is by far not as strict as it might be, yet it undoubtedly exercises a beneficial influence. Altogether nine states put the limit at the same age. Yet in vain would you look for the name of any Southern State among these nine; 21 States have no limit at all, and among them are ten Southern States. The only limitations that exist in the South are as follows:

In Louisiana, 14 years for girls and 12 years for boys.

In West Virginia and Tennessee, 12 years for children of both sexes.

About fifteen States have different laws for the purpose, an obligatory school attendance for children working in factories; among them not a Southern State.

And how worthless even existing legislation is. Among sixteen States that have some kind of regular factory inspection, that have at least the office of factory inspector, there is only one Southern State—Tennessee—not one of the industrial States of the South. What good is it that the labor laws of Louisiana forbid factory work to girls under 14 years of age if there is nobody to watch that the law should be faithfully executed. Of course, there remains the possibility of a complaint through the regular channels. But whom would you expect to raise that com-

plaint? The parents against the factory owner? Or the factory owner against the parents? Or the 11-year-old girl against either of them?

When it comes to anti-labor legislation, however, the Southern legislative bodies all of a sudden awake and become quite active. Mississippi, Oklahoma, Kansas have anti-strike laws. Out of nine States with anti-boycott laws three belong to the South. How slow to defend the interests of labor, how quick to defend the interests of capital! This is true of all legislation in the United States, of course. All we wanted to indicate was how much worse legally the condition of the working man in the South than in the industrial North, East or Center.

Labor legislation is never granted as an act of charity by the benevolent legislators. It is compromise with the advance guard of the labor movement. Why, then, should there be any proper legislation where the labor movement is as weak as it is in the South. Yet the South is awakening, as a number of strikes during the last few years have shown. The following statistical data extracted from the tables in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (Carrol D. Wright), on strikes and lock-outs are instructive. Commissioner Wright has collected statistics as to strikes in the United States for the last twenty years (July, 1881-June 30, 1901), comparing the data for the entire United States with the data for all the Southern States, we arrive at the following conclusions:

Of the entire number of strikes during this period	
the share of the South was	7.345 per cent
Of the entire number of establishments affected by	
strikes during this period the share of the South	
was	5.777 per cent
Of the entire number of striking workingmen dur-	
ing this period, the share of the South was....	7.731 per cent
While of the entire number of workingmen in manu-	
factures, the South's share is	12.3 per cent
And of the entire number of manufacturing estab-	
lishments, the South's share is	16.4 per cent

In other words, the South had a great deal less than its proper share of strikes, which is very significant.

A great many important points in the industrial development of the South are here left undiscussed, for I have tried to touch only upon the most salient questions. I particularly regret not having worked out the statistical data concerning agriculture, but this would carry me too far. Whether a process of concentration is as inevitable in agriculture as it is in manufactures, we are not prepared to say. In any case, we could not expect this process at

the present stage of the development of the South. We must not forget that after 1868 there inevitably began a process of disintegration of the large plantations, which were based on slave labor. Nevertheless a certain process of concentration of energy goes on in the South as well as in the North. For even in the South population is moving from country into the city, while the farming population increased but 18.3 per cent within the last ten years, population of towns with less than 4,000 each increased 52.8 per cent, and that of cities above 4,000 38.4 per cent.

In closing, let us ask ourselves, what are the conclusions and practical results of all these facts and figures? They are very simple, indeed, almost elementary. The following twelve assertions will probably be agreed to by every unprejudiced reader:

1. In the process of economic evolution, the South is considerably behind the North.

2. But within the last thirty years the South is rapidly approaching the North, by growing and developing at a faster rate.

3. The main stimulus towards this development was the formation of a plentiful supply of free labor, and the influence of this stimulus began to assert itself as soon as the South recovered from the shock of the war.

4. Northern capital became an important auxiliary force, which accelerated the process.

5. The force that attracted Northern capital to the South was the opportunity of more extensive exploitation of labor.

6. This extensive exploitation is possible because of weakness of trade unionism, absence of labor movement and of labor legislation.

7. These conditions of capitalistic productions in the South must inevitably assert their influence over the conditions of labor in the North.

8. Thorough organization of Southern labor is therefore necessary to Northern labor as a measure of self-defense.

9. Trade-union and Socialist agitation in the South is therefore the most urgent order of the day.

10. Notwithstanding the past failures, there is being formed in the South, through efforts of capitalism, a receptive soil for such propaganda.

11. Industrial capital transforms the negro into a modern proletarian and in this way prepares the way for the solution of the negro question.

12. The American South presents temporary difficulties, but no organic obstacle to the evolution of the country towards a co-operative society.

Dr. I. M. Rubinow.

The Economic Interpretation of History.

THE standpoint from which one approaches the study of society or history is of the first importance. All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress. What is the reason for great changes in human thought and human life? What is the underlying motive force in social action?

Until the middle of the last century little or no attention was given to the subject of causation in history. A mere record of political events, dynasties, and military campaigns makes up the contents of the early histories. The old conception of society viewed history as a series of biographies of the great men who had successively appeared and drawn society onward. This was the "One Man Theory."

From this viewpoint Martin Luther was reckoned as the one person who by force of character and strength of will, brought about the Reformation. It was never seen that for years the old forms of Feudalism had been giving way, and the trading Bourgeoise rising into power, that a new individualism was coming into existence and that the religious change was only a small part of the great industrial economic change that was transforming all of society. Martin Luther was but the person whom conditions had produced and that the tide of events bore to the top and made its mouthpiece. He in himself had no power to stay or bring a Reformation. Years before other priests had said the same as Luther, but their words had no effect, for economic conditions were not ripe for change.

Again, Oliver Cromwell has been written of as the one individual who had the power to overthrow Charles I. and set a curb to the unrestrained power of monarchs. The conditions that made a Cromwell possible had been gathering for generations. He represented the bourgeoisie power, that was undermining the strength of the nobility. The struggle between Charles and Cromwell represented a conflict of great economic forces embodied in different economic classes.

Napoleon has filled pages of our histories. But Napoleon would have been no Napoleon if conditions had not worked together to make such a man possible. He was the product of the volcanic forces of the French Revolution. In France the trading class was growing in power. Napoleon simply stood for the interests of that class. He came in on the Revolutionary wave and because of the disorganized condition of France his domination was possible and natural.

Society, then, is not advanced to higher planes through the influence of individual great men. It is plain that great social changes arise from causes that strike roots deep down in the life of the mass of the people.

History written as it was, consisting only of a record of ruling dynasties, of kings, great men, battles and conquests, was a useless study. It must be a matter of the greatest surprise to a student of history, who has advanced beyond the point where he views it merely as an account of all these to note the slight reference to the industrial life of the people that historians content themselves with making. For instance, take the guilds, commercial and industrial, that played so prominent a part in civilized society for so many centuries, and yet it is but recently that any interest has been taken in the subject. In fact, we may say that industrial history itself has had its birth and development within the last half century.

Heretofore history had no continuity. It was conceived of as a series of isolated stages. There was no attempt to point out the growth of one stage from another. There was no effort to trace the thread of progress or the line of cause and effect that runs throughout society.

Not only did history lack continuity in time, but it was written by nations and had no connection geographically. We saw the rise and fall of kings in England and France, in Greece and Rome, in Egypt and Assyria, but that any of these exercised any influence on each other was utterly disregarded. No broad, continuous view of society was dreamed of. We pigeon-holed each country, and saw no relation of events.

A history of institutions was unknown and from the general view of things it was quite natural that all such institutions should be supposed to be eternal. The growth of present forms from earlier ones was inconceivable. To-day, under the influence of the theory of evolution, we have come to see that whether it be governments or industrial arts, whether it be customs or beliefs, we can no more understand their present forms without a study of their earlier forms than the chemist can understand the compound without reducing it to its elements.

Further there had not yet grown up that critical period in history that not only looked with critical eye on the conclusions but as well examined carefully all historical sources—throwing out the myths and fables and heroic tales that had gathered around the true thread of history.

It was Neibuhr who first began this work of freeing history from its mass of vagaries. Freeman yet further revolutionized the treatment of history. He pointed out that different races represent various stages of a common evolution. For example,

Japan has but recently passed through a stage of evolution that England had gone through a century ago. In other words, there is one great evolution, through which society as a whole is passing. Some races have gone on to higher stages, others have but reached a medium place yet. This gave rise to comparative history, and the tracing of the growth of institutions from nation to nation.

Up to the middle of the last century there was little or no philosophy of history and what there was, was more or less idealistic. Here we come to the broad dividing line between the position we are attempting to explain, the economic view of society, and the idealist's position. The idealistic position holds that ideas move society. A man may conceive a good thing and then persuade men to adopt it. In other words, as one writer has said, "Beautiful schemes may be thought out and then applied to society from without by propaganda." Hegel was one of the first to attempt a philosophy of history. He greatly influenced the thought of his time, and produced a revolution in philosophy by pointing out that all history is an evolution, not a collection of disconnected facts, as his predecessors had said. But Hegel's interpretation was, after all, idealistic. He clung to the belief that things develop themselves according to some "eternal idea." His great work really consisted in the discovery of a new method of thought and the principal thing that marked this method was the idea of process or development that ran through it. It was this method that once freed from its idealism laid the foundation for the economic view of society. It was this method that Hegel used when he stated that the history of society is the history of successive waves, and that Marx later employed when he described it as a series of class struggles.

Still another attempt of an idealistic character to explain the progress of society is known as the political interpretation of history. As pointed out by Prof. Seligmann, this holds substantially "that throughout all history there can be discerned a definite movement from monarchy to aristocracy, from aristocracy to democracy," and "a constant progress from absolutism to freedom." But "political change is not a primary, but a secondary phenomenon."

Finally, a third idealistic view of society has been held by those who have believed they saw in religion the keynote of social advance. As pointed out by numerous writers, religion is really a product and not a cause.

These three lines include practically all the important attempts to explain social growth from the idealist's standpoint. It was now possible for an interpretation of history to arise based on physical relations. Buckle's name is the one earliest connected

with the doctrine of physical environment. He explained that all psychical forces are conditioned by physical environment. He claimed that in early society the history of wealth depended entirely on climate and soil. He confined himself wholly to production, principally to the production of the food supply. He gave little attention to the problem of distribution and in fact confessed himself unable to deal with it.

The task that Buckle was unable to accomplish fell upon the shoulders of one well fitted to grapple with this intricate problem. Karl Marx was the originator of the idea of the economic interpretation of history. Buckle went no further than working out the effect of physical forces on production. Marx pointed out the fundamental character of economic changes in every phase of social life. His proposition was "that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Marx had been profoundly influenced by the writings of Hegel, as had many another young German of that time. He recognized, however, what others did not, that Hegel's work consisted of two parts and that the idea of process running through his method was the valuable thing. Combining with this method his studies in natural science, he arrived at the theory that "all social institutions are the result of growth, and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in any idea but in the conditions of material existence."

It is fairly well accepted that society as a whole may be compared to an organism. Its institutions, the superstructures, are determined in their form by the manner in which society produces and distributes its goods. An analogy between the social organism and that of a plant or animal may be drawn from the field of biology.

That the organs of animals are the result of conditions is shown by numerous examples. In countries where wolves are forced to feed mainly upon deer, the long, slim wolf has the best opportunity to survive, and in time the wolves in that locality become long-legged, slender animals.

At the same time nature economizes her resources, no material or energy is wasted in the struggle for existence. Everything is used in the most advantageous manner. In biology this is seen in the decay of certain organs when they grow useless, that are then said to have atrophied as well as in the growth or development of organs and faculties that have become necessary. The wings of the tame duck have atrophied or shriveled under domestication. Civilized man's senses of smell and hearing have grown

less acute than those of the savage, as they are called less into use. Exactly so, social institutions decay when the purpose for which they existed disappears and new institutions arise to meet new needs.

Prof Sumner of Yale says, "The notion that progress proceeds in the first instance from intellectual or moral stimulus, or that progress is really something in the world of thought and not of sense, has led to the most disappointing and abortive efforts to teach and elevate inferior races and neglected classes. The ancestors of the present civilized races did not win their civilization by any such path. They built it up through centuries of toil from a foundation of surplus material means, which they won through improvements in the industrial arts and in the economic organization."

Industrial life, the way in which men get their living is dominant, and as reasoning beings we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions. Throughout all the superstructures that have grown upon this foundation—governments, literature, ethics and education—there may be traced the predominating influence of the economic conditions of the time and place in which they were evolving.

For an illustration of this, let us turn to the field of ethics. It is well known that ethics is usually spoken of as a purely normative science, that is, one that outlines a certain system of laws for the governing of human action according to ideas of right and wrong. Within recent years there has grown up another side to ethical studies—the study of the actual relations of men in society at different periods and in different places and the tracing of the development of the idea of right and wrong. A large number of the economists have seen the relation that actually existing ethical systems in distinction from ideal systems bear to economic conditions. Marshall makes economic conditions among the most powerful in determining ethical relations. Patten likewise points out the economic foundations of morality. While Marx shows that as all other spheres of society arise from economics so ethics depend on the same cause.

Each great economic change has brought a corresponding change in codes of ethics. Men still in a state of savage warfare viewed certain acts as right. In the nomadic state virtues suited to the time appeared. With agricultural pursuits new changes arose, while industrial growth and modern capitalism have yet further modified the moral code.

Among warlike tribes any form of aggression was considered as one of the highest of virtues. At a certain stage of society, while tribes struggled with each other over their hunting and

fishing grounds, the very existence of the tribe depended on the boldness of its members. Fighting power, as Leslie Stephen points out, was the essential power of each race, hence we find a cultivation of the military virtues. The strong warrior was especially held in esteem by the Norse and ancient Gauls. Aggression in different forms continued throughout the period of savagery and into semi-civilized and civilized society until a new economic condition was introduced. Co-operation of some sort became necessary between men. They were forced together industrially and gradually aggression became a vice.

Again in European history we find constant accounts of the robberies committed by the Robber Barons. "At the opening of the 16th century public opinion not merely sanctioned open plunder by the wearer of spurs and by the possessor of a stronghold, but regarded it as his special prerogative, the exercise of which was honorable rather than disgraceful." Society offered no condemnation of these acts until economic change gave rise to the trading class. As this class grew in strength and social power public opinion began to look unfavorably on the nobles when they fell upon a train of merchandise. The trading class interests had now become powerful enough to dominate public opinion and open robbery finally became a vice.

One more example can be found in the old illustration from American history. So long as slavery in the North was profitable it was viewed as right, but when the long winters of the Northern States showed that hired labor was more economical, it became wrong. The industrial interests of the North caused the Civil War. It was fought for the purpose of making free labor cheaper than slave labor.

So we find that the economic conditions impress themselves on the literature, the government and the forms of education that exist in any period.

The supporter of the economic view of history is sometimes charged with laying his emphasis solely on the present environment. In fact, however, he takes into full consideration the other factors. At no time does he maintain that each stage of society begins *tabula rasa*. While he does lay particular stress on environment he fully recognizes the existence of heredity and that there are always the survivals of former stages that exert their influence upon the new conditions and institutions. In other words, we may say that the form and structure of the social organism is in a continual process of change and at any given time any portion of the organism—any institution or system of beliefs—is the product of a series of successive environments acting each in turn upon the product of the preceding environment.

Of first importance is the method by which social advance

has been made. The conflict of the ages has been between man and his environment. The question has been, how to gain control over the forces around him and turn them to his own and to the social good. "From the outset," as pointed out by Lester F. Ward, "there have been obstacles to the satisfaction of desire to remove which has required greater or less effort, and it is this effort that has resulted in change. In the animal world this effort (removal of obstacles) is mainly subjective. It transforms the organism, modifies organs, multiplies structures, and creates new varieties, species and classes. In man it does this too, but only to a limited extent. There the principal effects are modification of the environment to adapt it to the organs and faculties that he already possesses."

Primitive man faced the problem of providing himself with the barest wants of life—food, clothing, shelter. His slight knowledge, crude tools and material limited these to the scantiest amount possible and at the same time gave him little leisure from manual toil. Gradually as the rough stone tool gave place to the better bronze axe or the later iron implements, his wants multiplied and were better satisfied and at the same time leisure for some slight intellectual development was afforded.

Each improvement in technique and each new invention thus became the means of solving the problem of man vs. environment.

With the advent of civilized society and the breaking up of the old tribal organization, a series of classes appeared, each class that dominated society being brought to the front through some improvement in productive methods, and its existence depended upon the possession of certain things in society that other men, in order to live, were obliged to use—for example, the land was possessed by the nobles in feudal times, the land mines, factories and railroads by the capitalist to-day.

So, while man's productive power has so tremendously multiplied and he has bound the wind and water and made the fire and electricity obey him, we have the phenomenon of a large majority of the people still compelled to struggle with the bare problem that confronted the early savage—how to obtain food, clothing and shelter. At the same time the accumulated treasures of the intellect, of science, of art, have become to a large extent the possession of the few. All this is owing to the struggle of economic classes, the existence of which Marx was the first to point out.

The defender of the economic view of society is frequently charged with stirring up class antagonisms. To point out an existing fact, a truth, is never wrong. That classes exist few would deny. That the best way to remove them is by a candid recognition of their existence and the removal of their cause, seems self-evident.

May Wood Simons.

Meeting of National Committee.

THE meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, which was held on the 29th, 30th and 31st of January, was in many ways of great importance and significance. Our space is too crowded to enable us to give full reports of the meeting, and, besides, we have commented upon the most important action at considerable length in the editorial department. The principal action was the removal of the local quorum because of its favorable attitude towards fusion, and the removal of the national headquarters to Omaha. A number of important resolutions defining the position of the party on various subjects and outlining tactics for further action were adopted. These resolutions are given herewith.

TRADES UNIONS.

The National Committee of the Socialist Party in annual session assembled, hereby reaffirms the attitude of the party toward the trade union movement as expressed in the resolution on the subject adopted by the Indianapolis convention of 1901.

We consider the trade union movement and the Socialist movement as inseparable parts of the general labor movement, produced by the same economic forces and tending towards the same goal, and we deem it the duty of each of the two movements to extend its hearty co-operation and support to the other in its special sphere of activity.

But we are also mindful of the fact that each of the two movements has its own special mission to perform in the struggle for the emancipation of labor, that it devolves upon the trade unions to conduct the economic struggles of the working class, that it devolves on the Socialist party to fight the political battles of the working class, and that the interests of labor as a whole will be best conserved by allowing each of the movements to manage the affairs within its own sphere of activity without active interference by the other.

The Socialist Party will continue to give its aid and assistance to the economic struggles of organized labor regardless of the affiliation of the trade unions engaged in the struggle, and will take no sides in any dissensions or strifes within the trade union movement. The party will also continue to solicit the sympathy and support of all trade organizations of labor without allowing itself to be made the ally of any one division of the trade union movement as against another.

We also declare that we deem it unwise to invite trade unions as such to be represented in the political conventions of our party.

LECTURE BUREAU.

That the National Secretary be instructed to proceed forthwith to the establishment of a lecture bureau. Such bureau shall consist of as many competent and efficient lecture members of the party in good standing as can be secured and utilized. The duty of such lectures shall be to expound the principles of Socialism, but not to discuss party affairs, policy or tactics.

The National Secretary shall arrange the lecture tours in conformity to the needs of the State and desires of the State organizations where such exist; the expense of the tour shall be divided between the States and locals and organizations affected as equitably as possible. The arrangements of the National Secretary shall require the approval of the local quorum and shall be subject to revision by the national committee in the same way as all other acts of the national secretary and local quorum.

The list of speakers shall be furnished to all organized States, together with mention as to the peculiar qualifications, terms, etc., of each speaker.

GERMAN ELECTIONS.

Whereas, Our comrades in Germany are at the present time engaged in a grand fight not only for the material interests of the proletariat in Germany, but also for the elementary human rights to political freedom against the oppression of a tyrannical autocrat; therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Committee of the Socialist Party in America, in common with the proletariat of the civilized world, hereby expresses its admiration for the magnificent stand and steadfast courage of our German comrades, together with an expression of confidence in their ultimate triumphs.

ANTI-FUSION.

Whereas, The history of the labor movement of the world has conclusively demonstrated that a Socialist Party is the only political organization able to adequately and consistently conduct the political struggles of the working class, and

Whereas, All "radical and reform" parties, including the so-called "Union Labor Parties" have, after a brief existence, uniformly succumbed to the influence of the old political parties and have proven disastrous to the ultimate end of the labor movement, and

Whereas, Any alliance direct, or indirect, with such parties, is dangerous to the political integrity and the very existence of the Socialist Party and the Socialist movement, and

Whereas, At the present stage of development of the Socialist movement of this country there is neither necessity nor excuse for such alliance; therefore, be it

Resolved, That no state or local organization, or member of the party shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise, with any political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations in order to further the interests of candidates of such parties or organization.

Any state or territorial organization taking any action in violating the anti-fusion resolutions adopted by this committee at St. Louis, January 31, 1903—or adopting a constitution or platform in conflict with the national constitution or national platform, and on the neglect or refusal of any such state or territorial organization to conform or to enforce such conformity on the part of any local or locals or members thereof under its jurisdiction shall be proceeded against in the following manner:

1. Charges may be made to the National Secretary by any member of the National Committee.

2. When such charges are so made, the National Secretary shall notify the State Committee and the National Committeeman from the state, furnishing a copy of charges.

3. The National Secretary shall thereupon obtain statements of the facts in the case from both sides within thirty days and forthwith submit the same to members of the National Committee.

4. On the majority vote of the members of the National Committee sustaining such charges such state shall cease to be an integral part or sub-division of the Socialist Party of America; all such decisions, however, shall be submitted to a referendum of the party membership, including the state in question.

Organized Labor and the Militia.

At the present time the question of the attitude of organized labor to the militia is not confined to America. Even in the most popular republic in the world, Switzerland, the antagonism which rose from the use of militia in internal dissension has found expression, and it is instructive for the laborers of this country to know something of what has happened there.

At the beginning of October a strike broke out in Genoa among the laborers on the street railways, which finally led to the whole of the organized laborers of the city laying down their arms and declaring a general strike.

The militia received orders to hold themselves in readiness to keep "order," notwithstanding the fact that that order had not been in the slightest degree in danger. This militia was largely made up of laborers. Five or six hundred proletarian militia, among which was Mr. Siep, the labor secretary of Genoa, refused to respond to the order of assemblage for the purpose of shooting and bayoneting their striking brothers.

The bourgeoisie of the Swiss demanded punishment for the laborers, who they claimed had in this way betrayed the Fatherland. Naturally the organized laborers took up the cause of the militia who had refused service. The convention of the Social Democratic party, which was held in Bassersdorf in the canton Zurich, on the motion of the representative from Genoa unanimously adopted the following resolution: "The party congress assembled in Bassersdorf expresses its deepest indignation at the recent events in Genoa. It denounces absolutely the attitude of the Government of Genoa that has surrendered the general welfare and security to the interests of capitalism, and has sought by provocative demands to arouse violence. We especially protest against the use of troops against the Swiss citizens and against the attempt to use Swiss soldiers against the so-called internal enemies. We will in the future more than ever maintain our hostility to militarism. The convention in conclusion expresses the opinion that it would have corresponded better to the dignity and well being of the country if the bundesrat had used its influence from the beginning to bring about a peaceable agreement instead of supplying more troops to the ruling class of Genoa."

Eight days later the Social Democratic convention, which had met for the nomination of candidates to the national legislative body, occupied itself especially with the brave attitude of the 600 proletarian militia and unanimously adopted the following resolution of sympathy with them:

"The Social Democratic assemblage of electors expresses their great admiration and sympathy for the Swiss soldiers who refused to recognize the call to put down the Genoa general strike. In the firmness with which they resisted the commands of the criminal law they may have the joyful consciousness that the laborers of Zurich, and indeed the whole Swiss laboring class, look upon them not as the accused, but as the accusers.

"The example which they have given may be imitated everywhere where a government attempts in the defense of the interests of capital to oppose the citizens in plain clothes to the citizen in military uniform with weapons in his hands. The assemblage adds to this declaration of sympathy an energetic protest against militarism and against class politics, which endeavors to use the Swiss militia against so-called internal enemies and against the organized labor class."

The adoption of this resolution naturally did not shield the laboring members of the militia from the legal results, especially since the Swiss laborers in the election which had taken place at Genoa in the meantime showed that the laborers were very indifferent to their own interests. The accused military in Genoa were brought before a military court, the accusation of refusing service was brought against twenty-seven of them, and all those accused were convicted, sentences of punishment varied from two days to four months in prison. The highest punishment was given to Herr Siep, the labor secretary, with whom, as well as the other accused, the privileges of a citizen were abolished for one year.

The events in Genoa and the resulting sentences of proletarian militia afford a picture of what could easily come to pass in the United States; perhaps there would be this difference, that American judges are by no means Swiss judges; very likely in such a case the accused laborers would be sentenced to four years rather than four months.

The appearance, during the events in Schenectady, where the painters' union of that place expelled one of its members because of his membership in the militia, and the prosecution which the bourgeois members inaugurated against this labor organization, shows us what is to be expected from the bourgeoisie and the judges in cases of strikes or other labor struggles, if proletarian soldiers should refuse to march against striking workers. The events at Genoa are in our opinion the best possible proof that the labor organizations are right when they oppose the military service of their members. But until the present time there has been no uniform opinion as to the proper attitude of the laboring class under such circumstances. While on the one side the view has been continually growing that the soldiers of the militia shall be kept out of the ranks of organized labor, on the other hand the

point of view has been offered that all laborers should join the militia regiments in order that the laboring class should have the majority of such regiments; in such a case it was thought that if it came to actual conflict the weapons which the proletarians would have received as members of the militia could be used against their enemies and in the defense of their own class.

This last view has at first appearance much attraction, what seems more evident than that it would be impossible to force the laborers to act against their own interests.

The events in Genoa show us, however, that this conclusion is a false one. The state from now on is by no means dependent upon the power of arms alone for its maintenance, it is the whole ruling social system that supports it. Laws, judiciary, government, legislation, possession, the whole social structure tied together with a thousand cords.

If a large number of militia soldiers refused to serve against the laborers, the state at once enters as executive. They would be punished as they were in Genoa and as we have seen in America under similar circumstances.

The phrase, "The militia must be democratized," has no meaning under present conditions. The American militia certainly could not be more democratized than is the Swiss militia. In Switzerland, every soldier (and every citizen capable of bearing arms must be a soldier), has his weapon at home so that he has complete control over it. In spite of this Genoa has shown that the democratization of the militia goes to pieces before the class antagonism and that laborers can be compelled to raise their weapons against their own class or else be sent to prison.

Certainly it can be said that with the entrance of the laboring class into practical politics and the increase of their political influence, their resolutions will change. This may be true, but only in a very restricted degree.

Suppose that the political labor party, and the Social Democracy was represented in a respectable minority in legislative bodies. Does any one actually believe that this would give the possibility of changing the fundamental legal forms in such a way that the militia could not be used in internal unrest? To ask such a question is to answer it in the negative, as long as there is a capitalist social system and so long as internal unrest are in the majority of cases identical with the unrest of laborers. There can be no legislation enacted contrary to the interests of the majority who are dependent upon the existing system. The militia has exclusively and expressly the single question of keeping "order" as it exists to-day, and the person who rules to-day, and the property of those persons. So long as the laboring class does not have political control, so long as laborers do not have a majority in the

legislative chamber, so long the antagonism between the laborers and the militia will remain and the laborers will be right in considering the militia as their enemies. To be sure, it will be wholly different when the labor class have conquered the political power in the state; then it may be necessary to put a weapon in the hand of every laborer, but at that time, however, the question of the militia can easily be pushed to one side by the importance of the other questions which will then come up for solution.

This article is translated from the St. Louis Arbeiter Zeitung, but the editor of that paper states that portions of it have appeared in the New York Volkszeitung and other German papers, and hence he does not claim credit.—A. M. Simon, translator.

Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid."*

ENRICO FERRI has pointed out in his work on "Socialism and Modern Science," how frequently the defenders of the present order have attempted to bolster up their position by arguments drawn from the field of evolutionary philosophy. They have mainly rested on the doctrine of the "struggle for survival." Kropotkin shows that there is an wholly other side to this question of no less importance. The principle of mutual aid or association for mutual protection and aggression is shown to be no less fundamental. It is pointed out that this fact was not overlooked by Darwin, but that his followers have laid all the emphasis upon the evolutionistic side of his doctrine.

Kropotkin shows how this principle runs through the whole biological world. He traces its foundations among the savages and barbarians in the cities of the Middle Ages and finally its manifestation in present society. He tells us that "Mutual aid is met with even amidst the lowest animals, and we must be prepared to learn some day from the students of microscopical pond-life, facts of unconscious mutual support, even from the life of micro-organisms." In locusts, beetles, land crabs and ants, he finds numerous instances of association for mutual assistance. But it is when he comes to the birds that the principle really begins to reach almost a dominating position. It enters throughout the whole life of birds, but in the time of migration even varying species gather. "All wait for their tardy congeners, and finally they start in a certain well-known direction—a fruit of accumulated collective experience—the strongest flying at the head of the band, and relieving one another in that difficult task. . . . Going now to mammals, the first thing which strikes us is the overwhelming numerical predominance of social species over those few carnivores which do not associate. "The cat tribe is offered as almost the only one which "decidedly prefer isolation to society, and are but seldom met with, even in small groups."

The last remnants of Malthusianism are swept aside, as he shows that practically nowhere in the world does animal life come anywhere near the limit of the resources available for subsistence.

"It is hardly necessary to say that those mammals which stand at the very top of the animal world, and most approach man by their structure and intelligence, are eminently sociable. . . . In the monkey and ape tribe from the smallest species to the biggest ones sociability is a rule to which we know but few exceptions." The intimate dependence of this associative principle upon the

*Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution. By Peter Kropotkin. McClure, Phillips & Co. Cloth, 348 pp., \$2.00

evolution of the individual and the maintenance of life is continuously pointed out—"That life in societies is the most powerful weapon in the struggle for life, taken in its widest sense . . . could be illustrated by any amount of evidence. . . . Life in societies enables the feeblest insects, the feeblest birds, and the feeblest mammals to resist, or to protect themselves from, the most terrible birds and beasts of prey; it permits longevity; it enables the species to rear its progeny with the least waste of energy and to maintain its numbers albeit a very slow birth-rate; it enables the gregarious animals to migrate in search of new abodes. Therefore, while fully admitting that force, swiftness, protective colors, cunningness and endurance to hunger and cold, which are mentioned by Darwin and Wallace, are so many qualities making the individual, or the species, the fittest under certain circumstances, we maintain that under any circumstances sociability is the greatest advantage in the struggle for life. Those species which willingly or unwillingly abandon it are doomed to decay; while those animals which know best how to combine, have the greatest chances of survival and of further evolution, although they may be inferior to others in each of the faculties enumerated by Darwin and Wallace, save the intellectual faculty. The highest vertebrates, and especially mankind, are the best proof of this assertion. As to the intellectual faculty, while every Darwinist will agree with Darwin that it is the most powerful arm in the struggle for life, and the most powerful factor of further evolution, he also will insist that intelligence is an eminently social faculty. Language, imitation and accumulated experience are so many elements of growing intelligence of which the unsocial animal is deprived."

However, he does not by any means entirely overlook the importance of the idea of struggle: "No naturalist will doubt that the idea of a struggle for life carried on through organic nature is the greatest generalization of our century. Life is struggle; and in the struggle the fittest survive. But the answers to the questions "by which arms is this struggle chiefly carried on?" and "Who are the fittest in the struggle?" will widely differ according to the importance given to the two different aspects of the struggle; the direct one for food and safety among separate individuals, and the struggle which Darwin described as 'metaphorical'—the struggle, very often collective, against adverse circumstances."

"Don't compete! competition is always injurious to the species, and you have plenty of resources to avoid it! That is the tendency of nature, not always realized in full, but always present. That is the watchword which comes to us from the bush, the forest, the river, the ocean. 'Therefore combine—practice mutual aid.' That is the surest means for giving to each and to all the greatest

safety, the best guarantee of existence and progress, bodily, intellectual, and moral. That is what Nature teaches us; and that is what all those animals which have attained the highest position in their respective classes have done. That is also what man—the most primitive man—has been doing; and that is why man has reached the position upon which we now stand, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters devoted to mutual aid in human societies.”

He next proceeds to review man, and points out that “Darwin so well understood that isolately-living apes never could have developed into man-like beings, that he was inclined to consider man as descended from some comparatively weak but social species, like the chimpanzee, rather than from some stronger but unsociable species, like the gorilla.”

In his study of savagery he does not idealize but he does recognize that “the primitive man has one quality, elaborated and maintained by the very necessities of his hard struggle for life—he identifies his own existence with that of his tribe; and without that quality mankind never would have attained the level it has attained now.”

Even throughout barbarism this effect of mutual aid continued to develop and in the later stages of barbarism came together in the village community in which the principle of association began to be territorial rather than consanguineous: “The conception of a common territory, appropriated or protected by common efforts, was elaborated, and it took the place of the vanishing conceptions of common descent. The common goods gradually lost their character of ancestors and were endowed with a local territorial character. They became the gods or saints of a given locality; ‘the land’ was identified with its inhabitants. Territorial unions grew up instead of the consanguine unions of old, and this new organization evidently offered many advantages under the given circumstances. It recognized the independence of the family and even emphasized it, the village community disclaiming all rights of interference in what was going on within the family enclosure; it gave much more freedom to personal initiative; it was not hostile in principle to men of different descent, and it maintained at the same time the necessary cohesion of action and thought, while it was strong enough to oppose the dominative tendencies of the minorities of wizards, priests, and professional or distinguished warriors. Consequently it became the primary cell of future organization, and with many nations the village community has retained this character until now.” In this stage the idea of private property with its separative force has begun to appear, but by no means to become dominant.

He next takes up the associations of the Middle Ages. Here

he is on more familiar ground, as the Socialist writers have long pointed out the remarkable associative character of this historical stage. The mediaeval city, while having many points of difference, had a remarkably common type: "It was an attempt at organizing, on a much grander scale than in a village community, a close union for mutual aid and support, for consumption and production, and for social life altogether, without imposing upon men the fetters of the State, but giving full liberty of expression to the creative genius of each separate group of individuals in art, crafts, science, commerce, and political organization."

He grows enthusiastic over the work and labor conditions of the guild: "We are laughed at when we say that work must be pleasant, but—'every one must be pleased with his work,' a mediaeval Kuttentberg ordinance says, 'and no one shall, while doing nothing, appropriate for himself what others have produced by application and work, because laws must be a shield for application and work.' And amidst all present talk about an eight hours' day, it may be well to remember an ordinance of Ferdinand the First relative to the Imperial coal mines, which settled the miner's day at eight hours, 'as it used to be of old,' and work on Saturday afternoon was prohibited. Longer hours were very rare, we are told by Janssen, while shorter hours were of common occurrence. In this country, in the fifteenth century, Rogers says, 'the workmen worked only forty-eight hours a week.' The Saturday half-holiday, too, which we consider as a modern conquest, was in reality an old mediaeval institution; it was bathing time for a great part of the community, while Wednesday afternoon was bathing time for the Geselle. And although school meals did not exist—probably because no children went hungry to school—a distribution of bath-money to the children whose parents found difficulty in providing it was habitual in several places. As to Labor Congresses they also were a regular feature of the Middle Ages. In some parts of Germany craftsmen of the same trade, belonging to different communes, used to come together every year to discuss questions relative to their trade, the years of apprenticeship, the wandering years, the wages, and so on; and in 1572 the Hanseatic towns formally recognized the right of the crafts to come together at periodical congresses, and to take any resolutions, so long as they were not contrary to the cities' rolls, relative to the quality of goods. Such Labor Congresses, partly international like the Hansa itself, are known to have been held by bakers, founders, smiths, tanners, sword-makers and cask-makers."

There were federations of the cities themselves for mutual action, as has been frequently pointed out. To those who still look upon mediaeval times as the "Dark Ages," the following quotation on the accomplishments of that age will come somewhat as a sur-

prise. "The results of that new move which mankind made in the mediaeval city were immense. At the beginning of the eleventh century the houses of Europe were small clusters of miserable huts, adorned with but low, clumsy churches, the builders of which hardly knew how to make an arch; the arts, mostly consisting of some weaving and forging, were in their infancy; learning was found in but few monasteries. Three hundred and fifty years later, the very face of Europe had been changed. The land was dotted with rich cities, surrounded by immense thick walls which were embellished by towers and gates, each of them a work of art in itself. The cathedrals, conceived in a grand style, and profusely decorated, lifted their bell-towers to the skies, displaying a purity of form and a boldness of imagination which we now vainly strive to attain. The crafts and arts had risen to a degree of perfection which we can hardly boast of having superseded in many directions, if the inventive skill of the worker and the superior finish of his work be appreciated higher than rapidity of fabrication. The navies of the free cities furrowed in all directions the Northern and the Southern Mediterranean; one effort more and they would cross the oceans. Over large tracts of land well being had taken the place of misery; learning had grown and spread. The methods of science had been elaborated; the basis of natural philosophy had been laid down; and the way had been paved for all the mechanical inventions of which our own times are so proud. Such were the magic changes accomplished in Europe in less than four hundred years. And the losses which Europe sustained through the loss of its free cities can only be understood when we compare the seventeenth century with the fourteenth or the thirteenth. The prosperity which formerly characterized Scotland, Germany, the plains of Italy, was gone. The roads had fallen into an abject state, the cities were depopulated, labor was brought into slavery, art had vanished, commerce itself was delaying."

When he comes to treat "Mutual Aid Amongst Ourselves," he is somewhat less satisfactory. Here his almost ridiculous "Statophobia" makes him look with horror upon association which is in any way connected with political forms. He seems utterly unable to see that the mediaeval city which he admired so much was a much more authoritative organization at many points than even the modern state, although to be sure in its most perfect form it approximated to the ideal of the future society upheld by Socialists, in that it was an administration of things. Kropotkin points this out when treating of the mediaeval city, but seems incapable of realizing that the present disorder is laying the form for a future association which shall be as much larger and better than that of the mediaeval city as the world market is larger than the city.

In his explanation of the causes of social evolution and the rise and fall of institutions, he is particularly weak. It is quite manifest that he is pursued by the ghost of economic determinism and fears lest he should yield to it in the least, so he accounts for the downfall of the mediaeval city by the fact that for two or three hundred years it was "taught from the pulpit, the university chair, and the judges' bench, that salvation must be sought for in a strongly-centralized state, placed under a semi-divine authority." Scientist though he is, it never appears to enter his head that this phenomena must have had a cause and did not arise from the "natural depravity" of its teachers. He has one rather striking illustration, however, in his discussion of "Mutual Aid Amongst Ourselves," which will be appreciated by every Socialist writer: "Every Socialist newspaper—and there are hundreds of them in Europe alone—has the same history of years of sacrifice without any hope of reward, and in the overwhelming majority of cases, even without any personal ambition.

"Every quire of a penny paper sold, every meeting, every hundred votes which are won at a Socialist election, represent an amount of energy and sacrifices of which no outsider has the faintest idea. And what is now done by Socialists has been done in every popular and advanced party, political and religious, in the past. All past progress has been promoted by like men and by a like devotion."

A. M. Simons.

The Historical Study of Sociology.

THE welfare of the individual is bound up in that of the community. It is true that the community is composed of individuals, and that its welfare is the sum of theirs. But it is no less true that the welfare of each individual depends on the corporate action of the community, whether in the sphere of sentiment, or in that of politics and law. Consequently the study of this corporate action and of the principles by which it may be directed so as to insure the largest happiness, is of all studies the most important to civilization and to mankind. To the people of a democratic country it is doubly important, because their future rests mainly in their own hands.

The subject of this study is marked out by its object. It deals with the action of groups, which, whether consisting of racial, political, or economic, aggregates, act together; and with that of classes composed of individuals, who, though acting each for himself, yet act under similar circumstances, from identical motives, and for parallel ends. The principles underlying their activity are the same which underlie the separate activity of individuals, but the elimination of special circumstances makes it possible to co-ordinate the former into a science. But it does not deal with activity of every kind. It has nothing, except indirectly and occasionally, to say about the progress of discovery in the physical sciences, about invention, about the extension of man's power over the world. It deals only with the psychic life—with conduct, whether proceeding from interested or disinterested motives, with the delimitation of conduct which ought to be enforced from that which ought to be left to discretion, and with the organizations which have been formed in order to carry the purposes at which either class of conduct aims, and the enforcement of that which is to be enforced, into effect. It therefore amounts to a co-ordination of the social sciences—economics, ethics, juristics, and civics; though their boundaries, as ordinarily understood, may require some rectification to bring them within this grouping.

And this subject must be dealt with historically. Since the object is to guide the progress of civilization within the prescribed boundary, we must, unless we are to degenerate into Utopia-builders, ascertain how human nature has progressed, in order that we may detect the principles which underlie social change, and the course which it has hitherto taken, and, from the data so obtained, may forecast the course which it will take in future. The conviction that such a forecast is possible under-

lies the whole of this science. We cannot change the course which will ultimately be taken by civilization, nor need we desire to do so, for the course which will ultimately be taken is the best. What we can do is to make that course more rapid and less painful—to eliminate mistaken efforts by which, in the future, as in the past, amelioration may be sought by means not adapted to accomplish it; and to guard against the suffering which every advance in political or economic conditions has hitherto entailed upon large masses of mankind. It is this that I mean by guidance. It is not a substitute for forecast, but is only possible in combination with it.

The possibility of forecast, and the fact that social change ultimately makes for betterment, depend on the same principle. The object of all human action except the rarest and most perverse, is the welfare either of self or others; and, though sometimes this object is sought by means which involve the suffering of an individual or of a group or class, yet that suffering is only an incident. Besides, when a group or class is the sufferer, its constant resistance leads in the end either to its extermination or absorption, or to its advance to a level with the oppressor, and the result, over long periods of time, is necessarily progress. The fact of this progress has been frequently noticed, but its cause has been so little understood that it has been thought necessary to refer it to the direct action of providences. Yet this progress has not been uninterrupted. There are nations which have remained for millenniums without perceptible advance; there have been instances of national decadence and of the overthrow of national independence, there have been checks and retrogression, and it is only when we survey mankind as a whole, or when we take the most restless races and extend our glance over considerable periods of their history, that we can see that the course has, on the whole, been upward. But, when we do this, we can see, not only an advance as a whole, but certain definite lines of advance, many of which the writer has catalogued, and of which an example may be found in the continual enlargement of the political unit, with the result, and often with the purpose, that ever-increasing areas are brought, as regards their mutual relations, within the domain of law.

It is by determining the cause of this advance, the means by which it has been and is accomplished, its course, and the resulting stages through which it has passed, that we can determine also the stages through which it will pass in the future, and so arrive at a conception of the true character of history. The cause we have already found in the desire for betterment. The interaction of human nature and its environment is the means. The action of man changes his ideals, institutions and laws, and

changes also the face of physical nature; this changed environment reacts upon human nature itself, those characteristics which are ill-adapted to it being subordinated or even atrophied, while those which are well-adapted are called into activity; the changed man makes another change in his environment; and the succession of these changes constitutes history. The course which this change has taken has been already glanced at. But the instrument by which it has been effected has hitherto been strife. There is not space here to enter at length into the question of the emotions and the will. But it is impossible to understand what follows without some explanation of the writer's views. He conceives that mental effort is normally self-determined, but that the soul is swayed by emotional and other impulses which play on it as the winds and waves play upon a ship, and which, difficult at all times to resist, sometimes attain such force as to deprive it of its freedom. That these impulses do not proceed from the man himself is plain from the fact that he often does resist them, and sometimes with success. They, therefore, must be referred, like many of the activities of physical nature, to a cosmic source, whatever the theory held respecting the nature of the cosmic source may be. Now some of these impulses prompt to aggression, and others to resistance; and it is the fact that human nature has been subjected to the aggressive and to the combative emotions which has made history what it is. If it had not been for these, human society would have crystallized at once into a communal form, or without assuming any definite structure, would have involved a generous communication of commodities and of good offices which would have been practically equivalent to it. Such a social condition would have afforded but little incentive to ingenuity. Progress in the arts and sciences, if it had existed at all, would have been very slow. Learning would have been at best an exercise of the intellectual powers or a means of gratifying curiosity, and would have been cultivated by few. There would have been no need of the elaborate machinery of government and of law. Customs would have been simple, inoffensive, and undefined. Substantially, there would have been no progress, nor would any need of progress have been felt. Life would have been one unbroken idyll—without care, without misery, but also without strenuousness and without knowledge. Rousseau's "state of nature" would have been realized. If, however, the aggressive impulses had been present without those that prompt to resistance, the weaker party would have been afraid, whenever the chances of success were against them, to risk the penalties which attend on unsuccessful revolt; and history would have been a record

of luxury on the one side, misery on the other, and debasement on both.

We owe progress then, and the need of progress, to the aggressive and combative emotions. Mankind, for purposes alike of aggression and defense, segregate themselves into groups, political, economic, and social, and the continual struggles between these make history. Strife is the condition of rapid and definite social change, whether retrogressive or progressive, but progress may in some degree result from a gradual process unaccompanied by it. The theory that "struggle" is the condition of progress involves a verbal awkwardness. "Struggle" is the effort of the attacked party to emancipate himself; and, when aggression has taken place, struggle is necessary in order to prevent retrogression. And without aggression, the wits would not have been sharpened, nor would intellectual progress or its economic results be great. But experience of the strife which aggression causes, and of the misery which results both from strife, directs intellectual effort toward their elimination. And, in time, society will attain, in combination with an intellectual power, a knowledge and a mastery over nature, which, but for the aggressive emotions it would not have possessed—that communal structure which, but for those emotions, it would have assumed from the first. For that result the whole course of the collective life of man has been and is a discipline.

History, if you take it in its full sweep, including the future as well as the past, presents all the characteristics of a tragedy. It is because the future has been assumed to be impenetrable that this fact has been veiled from us. If history be a tragedy that portion which is past must disclose some acts only—it cannot exhibit the issue. Nor does the history of a particular nation constitute a whole. Some nations, like some individuals, are cut off in their prime; and even if sometimes sin is followed by retribution, as when Roman aggression led to luxury, luxury to decadence, and decadence to subjugation; yet reformation, the highest element in tragedy, is wanting. But, in universal history, aggression leads to strife and both to suffering—the effort to obtain relief sharpens the intellectual powers, and leads to knowledge, invention and mastery over nature, and, above all, to improvements in the social structure itself, designed to restrict the sphere of the aggressive emotions—and forecast shows that this again will lead, in the yet dim, but not undiscernable, future, to their elimination.

If history be a tragedy, progress must have a finite goal. The human race may continue as long as this earth shall last; knowledge, too, may continue to increase, though freed from the spur which has goaded it hitherto, but the time must come when

the agonising struggle which has led so many into sin, so many into indifference, and so many into pessimism, will be over, and the political structure, and the ethical and economic life, shall have reached their final form—that form in which they will be best adapted to a humanity elevated to the highest level which is consistent with its finite limitations. This final form cannot be attained now—not merely because large masses of people cannot be persuaded to make a rapid and simultaneous advance, but also because human nature is not yet adapted to it. But if, as I have endeavored to show, human nature is capable of change; and if, as I believe, the change of which it is capable has a limit, it must produce and accommodate itself to the highest social structure and life which is compatible with it.

There are acts in the tragedy of history, Civilization has passed and will pass through definite stages, not, indeed, divided by fixed lines, but dominated each by a distinct principle, which dawns—rises to its zenith—and then declines while its successor is rising. The forces which cause each one of these can be discerned in its predecessor; and it is their regular succession which enables us, from observation of those that are past, to estimate those that are future. Writers on historic economics have seen this truth, and their suggestions as to the nature of these stages are valuable; but they have fallen short of the truth, because such writers have had to confine their view to one of the departments of social life, whereas, in each stage of progress, all these departments are co-ordinate, and are dominated by the same principle.

The succession of these stages of progress depends on the relative power of the different groups—racial, political, social, or economic—into which mankind have segregated themselves. Each of these groups is constantly fighting for the benefit of its own members, and against the other groups; and commonly there are two main groups so striving. Now, if the relative power of these groups is fixed, they are obliged to retain a fixed relation to each other. That relation may be one of equipoise—each group feeling itself unable, without too great risk, to aggress upon the other—it may be one of dominance—one group having another completely at its mercy; it may be intermediate between these—one group being in a position to dominate the other to a certain limited extent, and the other recognizing this and acquiescing; or it may be one of oscillation—each group dominating the other alternately. Finally, the groups may be merged into one group, whose members may have no interests antagonistic to each other. This last condition is the last act in the drama of history. Each of the earlier acts is constituted by the subsistence of one of the fixed relations; and, so long

as the groups stand in that fixed relation, their civilization remains in one of the stages or eras of progress. Such a relation may subsist for an indefinite period. It does not cease until the relative power of the groups is altered, and such an alteration is not a necessary result of the fixed relation, but is produced by some external cause, which, indeed, is very likely to happen at some time or other, but which need not happen within any particular period, however long. While the fixed relation subsists, the race or nation is unprogressive. When it is altered, strife—it may be military, it may be political, it may be economic—ensues between the groups until their relative strength has been ascertained, and then a new fixed relation emerges.

Each of these fixed relations is rendered possible by the grade of civilization which precedes it, and by the habits of thought and action which have been acquired in that grade of civilization. Hence they succeed one another in a regular order. If it were possible forcibly to establish any grade of civilization among a race not prepared for it, the people would not be able to accommodate themselves to it, and the attempt would fail. But of course, one race may be in a more advanced grade than another at any given time. The drama of history is acted by each race separately.

The eras of progress are five. I noticed this fact many years before I realized the tragic nature of history, but it is a remarkable coincidence that it corresponds with the number of acts in an Elizabethan drama. And, as the acts in a tragedy are subdivided into scenes, so are two of these eras also subdivided.

The first era is tribalism. This is subdivided into the period before and the period after the introduction of land-owning. That change does not make any sudden alteration in the habits of a tribe, but it sows the seeds of considerable further changes; and I think there is reason, from what we see in some parts of Africa, to believe that tribalism might have blossomed, though very slowly, into a more advanced civilization, without passing through a period of despotism. But all the most advanced races have passed through the second era—despotism—in which civilization has received impetus at the cost of great suffering. Despotism, in the sense in which the term is here used, means the dominance of one race by another. It generally takes the form of absolute monarchy, because the dominant race can assert its claims more effectively in that form than in any other, and because, as dominance originates in conquest, it is natural that the war chief, who is at first informally elected, should consolidate his power and make his dignity permanent and hereditary. But monarchy is not essential to it. Despotism succeeds tribalism because, in the constant warfare which is so marked

a feature in the life of savages, some one tribe finds itself more powerful than the rest. No doubt the superior military qualities of a leader often turn the scale, for prominent individuals are a factor in history, though their force has been over-rated. Be that as it may, despotism intensifies civilization, because, under its stern discipline, the subject race, or, as it later becomes, the subordinate class, is forced into habits of industry, while the dominant race is obliged to exercise its intellectual powers in the task of governing, and is at leisure to exercise them in other ways. But despotism, when it is administered wisely, even though only in the interests of the dominant class, confers one inestimable benefit on mankind—it necessitates a regular and defined system of law, however oppressive and one-sided that law may be. Under the reign of law the accumulation of wealth becomes possible, and a middle class rises to dispute with the dominant class for the possession of political power. The contest is slow, but wealth always triumphs in the end, and the great landed proprietors, though retaining their estates, lose all special privileges. But, in order to establish this condition it is necessary to lay down general principles respecting the right of all men to equality before the law, and these principles bear fruit in the emancipation of the lower class, whose outbreaks, in the earlier periods of history, has been always suppressed in blood. In time, the three classes accommodate themselves to their relative positions. As a general rule, though with some individual exceptions, a recognized standard of living prevails for each, and the members of each have incomes corresponding to it. Upon this understanding the three social classes, who had now settled down into the third era of progress—commercialism—might have remained in a condition of perpetual equilibrium, and civilization, having progressed into the highest condition compatible with individualism, might have rested as in a final form. Much happiness is compatible with this condition, and it does not imperatively call for further change. But its equilibrium was disturbed by the general substitution of nature-forces as industrial motors instead of the human hand. That change has produced a profound unrest in every department of life. It has from time to time rendered unnecessary the services of large bodies of workmen, and cast them on the market without providing for their instruction in any of the new callings which it has opened up. If this latter had been done no evil would have resulted, for it is an economic truth that there cannot be a general over-production of labor-power. But, as it was, great suffering and many deaths resulted from unemployment. As a remedy the rising generation of workers were better educated, and entrance into the learned professions was facilitated,

but the result has only been to overcrowd every department of intellectual life. Space would fail to describe the other economic difficulties which have arisen from this state of things—booms, depressions, strikes, “conspiracies” (so-called), oppressions and the most elaborately constructed frauds. Besides, the opportunities of employment have been mostly concentrated into cities, and population has necessarily followed them. But the attractions which cities present, and the necessity of making a good appearance before one’s neighbors, who, in cities, have one constantly in view, have increased the cost of living, especially among the working classes; and, though their remuneration has increased (which last can hardly be said of the professional classes as a whole), yet the standard of living has increased in a greater degree. This, combined with the frequent unemployment, and the unwillingness of women to live more cheaply after marriage than they have been accustomed to do before, has rendered marriage increasingly difficult and rare, and that again has increased unchastity, and indirectly has diminished the regard felt for the obligations of marriage when it is contracted. On the whole, the introduction of nature-motors into industry has brought in its train a seething unrest in every department of economic and social life, an unrest which will continue to irritate every fiber of the body politic until a remedy be found for it. That remedy must involve constant employment at a rate of remuneration sufficient for the maintenance of a family. But constant employment in a calling unalterably fixed cannot possibly be provided, because the amount of work in every calling is finite. Consequently, employment for the displaced can only be provided in other callings, and that can only be done by state action. And, as regards remuneration—once there was a time when, in each social class, the standard of living, the constancy of employment, and the rate of remuneration, corresponded. Now the incomes of different individuals in the same class, and in the same calling, and even of the same individual at different times, vary so enormously, and ups and downs of fortune are so frequent, that no rate can be fixed. In truth we have no social classes; but, instead, we have social coteries held together just so long as their incomes are approximately equal. Finally, the great employers of industry have the public increasingly in their grasp. The coal strike has strongly called public attention to this fact. I can see no remedy but State Socialism, with civil service rules, extended as the generations roll by, to every regular form of industry, whether manual or intellectual. No doubt political partisanship would have to be eliminated, and for that purpose an economic department of state, as free from outside control as the judicial department is now, would be re-

quired. But, after the institution of such a department, I can see no difficulty. Hence I have long believed that the fifth era of progress will be Socialism. To trace the slow future development from Socialism to Communism is unnecessary in an outline so short as this. I will conclude by saying that it is a mistake, in my judgment, to suppose that the life of early tribalism is communistic. This supposed fact has been given as a reason against the ultimate adoption of communal institutions, for, it is said, they would involve a return to an earlier stage of civilization. But, in truth, theft in early tribalism is punished very severely. The misconception was founded mainly on the fact that land, in early tribalism, is not owned individually, whence it was inferred that it must be owned collectively. But it is rights of sovereignty, not of ownership, which the tribe exercises over its roaming-ground. Land, at that period, is regarded as we regard air and sunlight—the ownership of it is not conceived as possible.

H. W. Boyd Mackay.

EDITORIAL

Observations on Present Party Affairs.

Last August we published an editorial entitled "Lines of Division in American Socialism," which attracted considerable attention and some hostile criticism. Every day since then has justified the positions there taken and fulfilled the predictions there set forth. The recent meeting of the National Executive Committee was particularly fruitful of illustrations of the truth of this editorial. We have seen the reports of several delegates and there was one point in which they were all remarkably agreed. All stated that there was no division on principles, but that when it came to details, discussion and disagreements were plentiful. This demonstrates the fact that the antagonism between the East and the West is one of temperament and of individual peculiarities and not one based on divergent economic interests. A very slight knowledge of American history would have shown that this suspicion and hostility regarding details is something that has existed throughout our history. Such knowledge would have prevented any such naive expression as was set forth by one delegate who seemed to think that it had arisen because "Some men in our party who should have known better have apparently made it their business to conjure up an antagonism between the West and the East." While there may have been some few comrades who had sought an opportunity to fish in these troubled waters, yet to account for the antagonism on such grounds is exactly analogous to the capitalist's explanation of the class struggle as being the result of the pernicious activity of troublesome agitators.

There is another explanation which exposes an ignorance, not alone of American history, but of Socialist philosophy as well, which is capable of very injurious results. There have been several statements to the effect that "The line is being drawn between agrarians and proletarians." Such a phrase is worse than an exposure of ignorance, it is absolutely pernicious. The word "agrarian" especially in the vocabulary of political Socialism is a direct importation from Continental Europe. It has brought along with it the meaning which attaches to it in that country, and in this sense it is simply ridiculous to apply it to the farmer movement of the great plains. The only great body of people in this country who are in any way comparable to the European agrarians are the farmers of the eastern and middle states, particularly of such states as Pennsylvania, New

York and Ohio. The farmers of these states, like those of Europe, are reactionary and obstructive of all progress. They will be found defenders of the high tariff as are those of Germany at the present moment, and in general their economic position and political ideas are similar to those who bear the name of agrarians in Europe.

Even the farmers of the eastern states have really little in common with the agrarian of Europe because of the fact that land ownership in this country has never carried any social distinction or any political power with it. There has never been a land owning, exploiting, farming class of sufficient size and coherency to constitute a political force in this country.

The farmers of the great plains are a wholly peculiar class much more comparable in economic position to the proletarians of the great cities than to the agrarians of Europe. When it comes to revolutionary attitude their actions are much more apt to be revolutionary than the wage workers, because of their hereditary character as the outcasts of capitalism. No proposal of compromise has ever yet come from the Locals of the Socialist party situated in this region.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that there is a strong trade union movement in this locality which is distinctly the most progressive and revolutionary in the United States, and this element undoubtedly constitutes the majority of the membership of the Socialist party in the western states.

The removal of the National headquarters to Omaha appears to us to be a mistake, but it was a natural reaction against the absurd and conceited sectionalism which for years had been preaching the doctrine that all wisdom was concentrated in a few of the great cities of the east.

An almost laughable illustration of the lack of knowledge existing in each section of the country concerning the other is seen in editorials which appeared simultaneously in the "New York Volkszeitung" and the "Appeal to Reason." The former declared that the only two cities which should be considered for National headquarters were New York and Chicago, and could see nothing of any revolutionary movement whatever in the neighborhood of Omaha. While the "Appeal to Reason" held that Omaha was "the center of the revolutionary section of the United States," and declared that this fact was so well known that "no argument need be adduced to prove this to a western man."

The reconciliation of these two contradictory positions is found in the different meaning which attaches to the words arising from different points of view. There is no doubt but that the real struggle with capitalism will center around the great industrial cities and the mining regions of the east and middle west. It is here that the great exploited proletariat is to be found, it is here that capitalism has reached its highest development and concentration has made industry ripe for socialization. On the other hand it is equally certain that the revolutionary elements even of this center have been largely driven west and are now to be found in the locality which "The Appeal to Reason" considers the revolutionary section. So it is that there is

at least a strong probability that the first electoral success will be gained in the Rocky Mountain and the Great Plain territories.

It is our personal opinion that while the geographical location of Omaha and its isolation from the industrial proletarian movement, which, in spite of the peculiar agricultural conditions in the United States, must always be the predominating and fundamental element in the Socialist movement, renders that city in many ways less desirable than some larger and more industrial cities, nevertheless this present change will be in many ways healthful. It will arouse new interest, bring new elements into the party, shake off a great deal of fossilized formalism, and in the end serve to make a better understanding throughout the party. It will be fatal, however, if the impression should go out that its removal to this city indicates any hostility on the part of the Socialist Party to the trade union movement, or even that it means a closer alliance with the A. L. U. than with the A. F. of L. For many reasons the Socialists will always feel more friendly to the economic organization which has adopted their political principles. But the fundamental fact that the trade union is organized primarily for fighting the class struggle in the economic field must not be overlooked. The corollary of this position is equally important that the Socialist Party is with the economic organization whatever its name and wherever it is fighting in the interests of the working class.

So far from there being any sign of hostility to trades unions from the western members it must be remembered that the rather extreme resolution requiring compulsory membership in trades unions of Socialist Party members was introduced by Comrade Mills, who is accused of being the leader of middle class sentiment. Right here again there is need of some intelligent understanding of the words which are used in Socialist economics. The words "middle class" have really little meaning in this country, as they originated in England, where society is classified into, first, a nobility, second large capitalists, and third small capitalists or middle class, and where the phrases "the upper and lower middle class" are parts of the ordinary vocabulary. If the words "middle class" has any meaning at all in America it is as applied to the small shop-keeper and small manufacturer, and to the retired farmer who lives by exploitation from rent. No more senseless use of the term could have been imagined than its application to the closely exploited farming class of the west. Just how the interest of these men will lead them to oppose any proletarian action, as is claimed by those who are antagonizing them has not yet been shown, and unless their interests do lead them to such action any arguments to show that they will adopt compromising tactics is a confession of lack of faith or lack of knowledge of Socialist principles.

We believe that the selection of Comrade Mailly for Secretary removes all possibility of misunderstanding in this direction. We are sure that no man could have been selected in whom a larger number of the Socialist Party would have such complete faith. His position as a trade unionist, his ability as a writer, and his tested skill as an organizer and director of a political movement fit him peculiarly for the position. In view of this fact we cannot but feel that the

referendum which is now being pushed forward to amend the constitution and remove the headquarters to Chicago is a rather hasty and perhaps ill-advised action. There is no question but that if the line of sectionalism can be forced that the proposed movement can be carried. The great bulk of the organized membership lies far east of the Mississippi river. This very fact should be a lesson to the western comrades of the need of organization by showing them their helplessness to enforce their influence in the party organization.

Another reason which will assist those who are seeking to remove the headquarters to Chicago is the unconstitutional and arbitrary action of the western comrades in moving the headquarters to Omaha and denying the referendum which is plainly provided for in the constitution. This was an inexcusable action notwithstanding that it could be paralleled a hundred times in the history of the United States by actions taken by the ancestors of the very men who did this. The rebellious pioneer has always had little respect for constitutions and little use for organization. He must, however, unlearn this hereditary characteristic if he is to work with his eastern ally for their common emancipation. Perhaps the greatest essential, next to education in Socialist philosophy, at the present time is a cohesive democratically controlled organization of the workers. On both the educational and organization side the western comrades are weak. This in itself would be no crime were it not for the assumed contempt with which they often treat these subjects.

It is another unfortunate feature of this controversy that as with so many other controversies there is a tendency to make it personal. The western comrades are already beginning to refer to Comrade Hilquit as being "tricky" and "schemy," while "The Socialist" of Seattle declares itself to have seen the "fine hand of Walter Thomas Mills" in the action. Those of us who are well acquainted with both of these comrades know that the allegation is equally uncalled for in either case. Both are shrewd men who know something of organizing the forces at their disposal and planning the lines of attack. To do this is no crime, and such language as that referred to is wholly uncalled for.

To talk of moving the headquarters as a rebuke to the unconstitutional action of the National Executive Committee is babyish, and this notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the N. E. C. represented but a small minority of the membership. The question of the locality of the headquarters should be determined independent of personal or sectional animosities. While as a permanent location Chicago has many advantages over Omaha, it is very certain that a headquarters which is perpetually en route is not conducive to the best work for Socialism, and since a national convention will meet in about a year it would seem to be an act of common sense to leave the headquarters in Omaha till then, and vote down the present referendum as a tendency simply to confuse and unsettle work.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Ever since the November election, when the Socialist party almost without warning piled up a quarter of a million votes, which was followed by a large vote in the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L., also unexpected and surprising, the capitalists and their politicians have been in a condition bordering on panic, judging from the comments of their newspapers, the interviews of their spokesmen, and the circular letters that have been sent broadcast. The National Association of Manufacturers has taken the lead in attacking the unions, and especially the Socialists in them. Its president, Parry, made personal charges against the writer as being a "confiscator" and a "dangerous citizen," because he dared to advocate Socialism in the A. F. of L. without the aid or consent of capitalists. Mr. Parry was promptly challenged to debate in Indianapolis, Cleveland or any other place, but up to this minute has refused to accept, making the absurd excuse that union men would be debarred from attending the meeting because he is being boycotted. In New York a National Economic League was recently formed for the purpose of educating workingmen, especially trade unionists, upon the fallacies of Socialism from a "non-partisan" standpoint. The league is composed of bankers, lawyers and politicians, who can see no good in Socialism. The New York Socialists also challenged the officers of the league, but they have dodged a debate up to the present. "The International Golden Rule League" was formed about a month ago, and also for the purpose of solving the world's great problems and establishing "rightful relations" between employers and employes. Besides these organizations, the employers' federation, formed in Dayton, Ohio, about two years ago, is spreading through the State, and, in fact, the country at large, while the National Civic Federation is establishing local organizations, and other local bodies are springing up everywhere. All this goes to show that the rapid industrial and political organization of labor, the strikes, boycotts and ballots of the class-conscious workers have stirred up the animals. Nor is it wise to pay no heed to these capitalistic bodies. They are growing wonderfully and gaining great power. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers had but two hundred members a year ago, and to-day President Parry declares the membership is over two thousand. Its power has already been felt in Washington, where Parry boasts they killed the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills, and in several State Legislatures, where the hand of organized capital is seen in the defeat of labor bills. A person in a position to know

informs the writer that the capitalists are fully aroused to the peril that confronts their class. They understand that the people are awakening, on the other hand, to the ravages of the trusts and combines, and for that reason they will leave no stone unturned to keep labor subjugated. The capitalists are liberal with their money and intend to organize every city, town and hamlet in the nation if possible, and their speakers, newspapers and pamphlets will be utilized to the best advantage to stave off the political revolution that they dread. The prediction of Senator Hanna about a year ago, to the effect that the next great political struggle will be between the Republican party and Socialism, bids fair to be realized. Daily developments are becoming highly interesting.

During the past month some of the national unions have made attempts to get together on the jurisdiction question. The printers, pressmen, bookbinders, photo-engravers and stereotypers led off with a conference in Indianapolis and arranged an agreement which will be submitted to the members either in convention or through the referendum, and the outlook for harmony in the printing trade is particularly bright. The rival teamsters' unions will hold a convention this summer and amalgamate, according to the decision arrived at by the arbitration committee. The sheet metal works and the independent rival will also hold conventions in the same place and at the same time for the purpose of combining. The plumbers and the independent steamfitters held a conference, but were unable to come to an agreement, and the decision of the arbitrator was in favor of the former, which will mean that a demand will be made at the next A. F. of L. convention for the withdrawal of the steamfitters' charter. The painters were given jurisdiction over the glaziers and carriage painters by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. at the recent session. The glaziers may yield and go into the painters' national union, but the carriage painters will not, as they are an important fraction of the carriage and wagon workers' union, and to abide by the decision might mean the dismemberment of the entire organization. The jurisdiction controversy between the brewers on the one side and the engineers and firemen on the other has been settled satisfactorily to the former. The brewers decided that the engineers and firemen in breweries may join the unions of their craft, provided that the A. F. of L. Executive Council or the next convention instructs other national unions that include engineers and firemen to turn those members over to their respective national unions. This action puts the jurisdiction proposition up to the powers that be in a manner that will show whether or not the brewers were singled out for attack by the "autonomists." Committees of the two national unions of carpenters are negotiating for a combination at this writing. Altogether the attempts to "get together" have been fairly successful, and unless new fights are started the Boston convention will be an improvement over the last one.

The labor press of the country is discussing with some interest the celebrated Taff Vale railway decision in England, where the unionists were mulcted out of \$140,000 damages for inaugurating a strike

and boycott, the courts holding that the organization is responsible for the acts of its members. There is considerable speculation as to whether the British decision will have any effect on future struggles between capital and labor in America. Apparently the Canadian employers are making an attempt to establish the English precedent in their soil, as the woodworkers of Berlin, Ont., have been sued for \$2,000 damages for boycotting. In Ohio also a case will be heard in Dayton in a few days, the metal polishers having been sued for \$25,000. There are similar cases pending in several other States, and, judging the future by the past, every effort will be made by the capitalists to confiscate the treasuries of the unions, and thus weaken them. The unions have been growing too rapidly to please the bosses.

The Brotherhood of Railway Employees, which includes all classes of workers, from track laborer to engineer, and which is reported to have experienced great growth in the extreme West, has voted to join the American Labor Union. The brotherhood has just won its first important strike, on the Canadian Northern railway, and is said to have 40,000 members. The A. L. U. is also cutting into the East, having secured several unions of engineers, bakery workers, etc., in New York City and a number of locals in Massachusetts. The flint glassworkers, who recently withdrew from the A. F. of L., may vote on the proposition of joining the A. L. U., the Philadelphia unions having petitioned for a referendum on the question, and it is said there are nearly eight thousand unionists in the latter city who are likely to join the new organization. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers also contemplates taking a referendum vote on the proposition of affiliating with the A. L. U. So far none of the local unions in the West which are under the jurisdiction of nationals and also affiliated with the A. L. U. have obeyed the summons to withdraw where made. In several instances the locals have openly defied the national officers, and in other cases the national unions are perfectly satisfied to have the locals retain their affiliation.

W. R. Hearst, the newspaper publisher, is making a scramble for the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket. His head has been turned by his election to Congress from one of the submerged districts in New York, where votes are purchased in large blocks for next to nothing. The sudden rise in Union Labor parties on the Pacific coast and in Connecticut towns has given him the cue to agitate for a sort of fusion between the Laborites and the Democratic party, as well as various scattered Populist and reform elements. Hearst also poses as "something of a Socialist," and in his wild endeavor to rattle around in the presidential chair he is not above practicing his familiar art of dissembling, and his organs quote Debs as saying that he would undoubtedly be the Democratic nominee and would secure the support of the Western unionists, who have declared for the Socialist party. Of course, Debs said no such thing, but similar statements will be made by the Hearst papers from now on. Hearst has already established a literature bureau, and his agents are soliciting the names and addresses of unions all over the country, and the organizations are being flooded with pamphlets and leaflets

recounting all the nice things that have been said about Hearst and what "he has done for labor," which literature finds its way into waste baskets as fast as received. If Mr. Hearst expects material support from the Union Labor party he is liable to be disappointed, because those parties are having their own troubles. The U. L. P. in San Francisco is in the throes of dissolution for the reason that Mayor Schmitz has appointed Republican machine politicians to nearly all the offices and snubbed the unionists, and the same report comes from Hartford, Conn. The Populist movement is gone where the woodbine twineth, and the Socialist party is a unit against any and all fusion deals.

Probably it will please American trades unionists to learn that Ben Tillett, the famous British orator, will make a lecture tour in this country beginning about the middle of October. Tillett has no peer as a public speaker, and the latest report from England has it that he is likely to be elected a member of Parliament by the combined Socialist and trade union voters in a strongly organized district.

It is reported that an attempt will be made in Canada to organize a secession movement. Not only are local unions to be withdrawn from the A. F. of L., but from the international organizations as well. The scheme has probably emanated under the hats of certain gentlemen who are anxious to become great leaders. The claims they make are that too much money comes across the border, and that whenever strikes are on in Canada officers from the States are sent over to direct affairs, and that they are unacquainted with local conditions and do not have the confidence of the public. The labor movement in Canada has taken phenomenal strides during the past three or four years. Previous to 1900 there were few unions in the Dominion, and it is doubtful if the total membership would foot up 15,000 at that time. To-day Canada can boast 1,100 unions, and the membership will aggregate 100,000. And a good many American dollars were spent to accomplish this work.

A scabby "organization" known as the National League of Independent Workmen of America is being formed in the East by non-union men, with the aid and consent of the employers. It is a shrewd scheme to disrupt union labor by posing as a labor organization. A promoter of the plan, Rev. R. F. Fairchild, of Albany, N. Y., in speaking of the proposed league, says: "The league is being organized. It is proposed to put a national organizer in the field and organize local branches all over the country, and demand that employers run their shops as 'open shops,' in which union and league men can have an equal chance of employment. The league will be strictly a laboring man's affair, but it will be incorporated so as to command the confidence of employers and the general public, and be in a position to defend the rights of its members through the courts. Only American citizens will be eligible to membership."

The tobacco trust is working a shrewd game that may not be generally known. During the past few months there has been quite an agitation started by small tobacco manufacturers and retail deal-

ers in different parts of the country, with the result that local organizations have been perfected which are to be merged into a national body—a sort of trust to oppose the big combine. But now the story comes from New York that some of the so-called independents are really owned and controlled by the octopus and they are lined up with the opposition for the purpose of keeping advised of every move that is being made against the big trust. This is the policy that was largely carried out by the Standard Oil monopoly and its success is well known.

The brewery workers have just closed a most successful special convention in Cincinnati. Despite the desperate fights that the union was in with the bosses in Boston, Cincinnati and other places during the past year, as well as the attacks that were made by other organizations in jurisdiction controversies, the brewers are more firmly united than ever. They have fully eighty per cent of the trade organized, and the heavy drain on their resources has developed such splendid discipline and loyalty that the union's credit is good for a large amount in the war chest. The brewers reaffirmed their allegiance to the principles of Socialism, and by almost unanimous vote the members were advised to extend their financial and moral support to the Socialist party.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Daughter of the Snows, by Jack London. J. B. Lippincott Company. Cloth 334 pp. \$1.50.

First and foremost this is a story—a story of the territory which Jack London has marked out in fiction as his own—the Klondike. It is not written to teach social economics, but it would be impossible for as thorough a Socialist as Jack London to write such a book as this and not have his attitude on social subjects show through. Frona Welse is a sort of Norse goddess who moves through the story somewhat as her ancient prototypes moved through the sagas of the Northmen. But this modern Brunnhilde has been to Paris and to Boston, reads Browning and quotes Whitman. Nevertheless she has lost none of her primeval characteristics. She is the incarnation of the gospel of the strong and her religion is the religion of the trail whose strongest test is being true to “bed and blanket.” She comes through the trail and through the Dyea Pass in the midst of a storm and with a series of most unconventional adventures. Her father “was a giant trader in a country without commerce, a ripened product of the nineteenth century, flourishing in a society as primitive as that of the Mediterranean vassals. A captain of industry and a splendid monopolist, he dominated the most independent aggregate of men ever drawn together from the ends of the earth. An economic missionary, a commercial St. Paul, he preached the doctrines of expediency and force. Believing in the natural rights of man, a child himself of democracy, he bent all men to his absolutism. Government of Jacob Welse, for Jacob Welse and the people, by Jacob Welse was his unwritten gospel. Single-handed he had carved out his dominion till he gripped the domain of a dozen Roman provinces. At his ukase the population ebbed and flowed over a hundred thousand miles of territory, and cities sprang up or disappeared at his bidding. . . . Men drifted into the land. Hitherto famine had driven them out, but Jacob Welse was there now, and his grub-stores; so they wintered in the frost and groped in the frozen muck for gold. He encouraged them, grub-staked them, carried them on the books of the company. His steamers dragged them up the Koyokuk in the old days of Arctic City. Wherever pay was struck he built a warehouse and a store. The town followed. He explored; he speculated; he developed. Tireless, indomitable, with the steel-glitter in his dark eyes, he was everywhere at once, doing all things. In the opening up of a new river he was in the van; and at the tail-end also, hurrying forward the grub. On the outside he fought trade combinations; made alliances with the

corporations of the earth, and forced discriminating tariffs from the great carriers. On the inside he sold flour, and blankets, and tobacco; built sawmills, staked town sites, and sought properties in copper, iron and coal; and that the miners should be well equipped, ransacked the lands of the Arctic, even as far as Siberia for native-made snowshoes, muclucs and parkas.

He bore the country on his shoulders; saw to its needs; did its work. Every ounce of its dust passed through his hands; every postcard and letter of credit. He did its banking and exchange; carried and distributed its mails. He frowned upon competition; frightened out predatory capital; bluffed militant syndicates, and when they would not, backed his bluff and broke them. And for all, yet found time and place to remember his motherless girl, and to love her, and to fit her for the position he had made."

The heroine is a true daughter of her father, and we feel instinctively when the contest begins for her favor between the smooth, superficial Gregory St. Vincent and the cool, hardy engineer, Vance Corliss, that the palm is to go to the latter. The final test comes when St. Vincent breaks the "faith of bed and blanket" and permits a man to be murdered whose cabin he was sharing without coming to his defense.

There is something almost Zola-like in the strength of the story, but it has none of Zola's diffusiveness and none of Zola's mannerisms. There are some striking descriptions of the free and easy life where man comes close to nature, some revelations of the strong character that may yet lie beneath those whom the world has socially seen fit to despise. But these points have been brought out before.

In *Frona Welse*, however, has been given a new character to fiction; she reveals characteristics that have been unknown to literature since the days of the sagas. Besides the few suggestive thoughts that are contained in the quotation already given, we find running through the book a philosophy of the strong which trenches on Nietzscheism. Sometimes this philosophy gives way before the Socialist thought that is in his mind as where he says: "These be the ways of men, each as the sun shines upon him and the seed blows against him, according to his kind, and the seed of his father, and the milk of his mother. Each is the resultant of many forces which go to make a pressure mightier than he, and which moulds him in the predestined shape. But, with sound legs under him, he may run away, and meet with a new pressure. He may continue running, each new pressure prodding him as he goes, until he dies, and his final form will be that predestined of the many pressures. An exchange of cradle—babes, and the base-born slave may wear the purple imperially, and the royal infant beg an alms as wheedlingly or cringe to the lash as abjectly as his meanest subject. A Chesterfield, with an empty belly, chancing upon good fare, will gorge as faithfully as the swine in the next sty. And an Epicurus in the dirt-igloo of the Eskimos will wax eloquent over the whale oil and walrus blubber, or die.

"Thus in the young Northland, frosty and grim and menacing, men stripped off the sloth of the south and gave battle greatly. And they stripped likewise much of the veneer of civilization—all of its follies,

most of its foibles, and perhaps a few of its virtues. May be so; but they preserved the great traditions and at least lived frankly, laughed honestly, and looked one another in the eyes."

But on the whole, as was said at the beginning, the story does not attempt to preach, but is simply a splendid story which brings one out of the conventionalities and commonplaces of our present society and lifts and exhilarates like a breath of fresh air to one coming from a crowded, overheated drawing room.

The Economic Interpretation of History. By Edwin R. A. Seligman. Macmillan Company. Cloth. 166 pp. \$1.50.

The Socialist reader of this book is forced to admit at once that it is one of the best presentations of one of the fundamental principles of Socialism that has ever been written and is in some ways far superior to anything that the English-speaking Socialists have themselves written on this subject. The thesis of *Economic Interpretation of History* is thus stated: "The existence of man depends upon his ability to sustain himself; the economic life is therefore the fundamental condition of all life." There have been various attempts at giving a unified interpretation of history. The first and most simple and most useless of these was the "great man theory." The second maintained that religion is the keynote of progress. The third explanation "might be called the political interpretation of history. It holds substantially that throughout all history there can be discerned a movement from monarchy to aristocracy, from aristocracy to democracy, and that there is a constant progress from absolutism to freedom, both in idea and in institution."

He then traces the origin of the theory of economic interpretation from Montesquieu, Buckle and others to Marx, whom he always concedes is entitled to credit for developing the theory. He considers the contributions the theory of Feuerbach, Lassalle and Rodbertus, but decided that " . . . if originality can properly be claimed only for those thinkers who not alone formulate a doctrine, but first recognize its importance and its implications, so that it thereby becomes a constituent element in their whole scientific system, then there is no question that Marx must be recognized as in the truest sense the originator of the economic interpretation of history. . . . Whether or no we agree with Marx's analysis of industrial society, and without attempting as yet to pass judgment upon the validity of his philosophical doctrine, it is safe to say that no one can study Marx as he deserves to be studied—and, let us add, as he has hitherto not been studied in England or America—without recognizing the fact that perhaps with the exception of Ricardo, there has been no more original, no more powerful, and no more acute intellect in the entire history of economic science."

Engels further developed the theory, but since then it has received little important addition save in ever wider and wider applications. When it comes to criticism of the theory we cannot agree with some of the bourgeois critics of this book that Professor Seligman is particularly successful. At the very beginning he adopts a sort of smart and patronizing air, and after accusing the Socialists of being too free

with their generalizations, he proceeds to declare that "some of his (Marx) statements are erroneous and not a few of his historical explanations are far-fetched and exaggerated." One would think that such a wholesale statement as this would require a little proof or at least an example or two, but nothing of the kind is offered.

The chapter on "Historical Law and Socialism" is decidedly weak. He seems to think he is arguing whenever he makes an assertion; for example he makes the following statement as if he was really hitting something, or somebody. "To suppose that private property and private initiative, which are the very secrets of the whole modern movement, will at once give way to the collective ownership which forms the ideal of the Socialists, is to shut one's eyes to the significances of actual facts and to the teachings of history itself. Rodbertus was at least more logical than Marx when he asserted that the triumph of Socialism would be a matter of the dim future." But the fact is that neither Marx nor any other Socialist writer of any prominence ever maintained such a catastrophelc theory as that which he here imputes to them. It is significant that almost no mention whatever is made of the one great document in which the economic interpretation of history is set forth in its clearest and most complete manner, the Communistic Manifesto. There is a note containing a portion only of the famous quotation in which the whole theory is summarized, and here he breaks off at the point beginning "and consequently the whole history." It is hard to believe that this was done unconsciously. Professor Seligman is too much of a scholar not to know that the rest of this sentence would have overthrown practically his entire argument by showing the intimate connection between the class struggle and economic determinism. Intellectual sense and fairness would have demanded the printing of this entire, or else the omission of all reference to Socialism.

It would be the easiest kind of work to make mince meat of his last two chapters. There are several other bad breaks as to facts in the book, as for example where Belfort Bax is classified among those who accept the economic interpretation of history and where Massaryk is quoted as a Socialist. On the other hand the elaborate notices and references constitute one of the best bibliographies which have ever been gathered in English, although even here it would have been possible to check his work on some points from the elaborate German bibliographies which exist.

Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy. By Joseph Lee. Macmillan Company. Cloth. 242 pp. \$1.00.

This book is the story of what has been accomplished in trying to heal the abuses of capitalism while leaving the thing itself untouched, and its name is about as much of a misnomer as possible. Indeed, the very terms are contradictory, and is as if one should speak of preventive therapeutics. Philanthropy presupposes that the social body is sick and you cannot speak of preventive treatment of the sick against disease. It is the well who must be treated preventively. Notwithstanding this misleading title the book contains much that is of value to the social student. Indeed, it is by far the best treatment yet offered

on the efforts which are now being made to improve conditions without touching fundamental causes. In many directions these workers have been brought in touch with problems which demand revolution in order to produce effective results, and in so doing their work offers suggestions of what can and will be done when social conditions are so altered as to make possible the things for which they are striving. This is especially true of the departments on "Vacation Schools," "Playgrounds for Small Children," "Baths and Gymnasiums," and "Industrial Training." In none of these fields, however, does the author seem to be aware of the fact that the Socialists are the only ones who have taken hold of these subjects from the foundation and are accomplishing more in many countries than all the boards, charity societies and organizations of which he has so much to say. The portion of the book dealing with the housing problem and the struggle with disease is simply a story of a struggle with a system of exploitation. Here again he has never heard of the work of the Belgian and Danish Socialists who have carried out most of the things at which he is aiming or have developed the ideas which he discusses much further than any of the authorities given by him. Yet until the work of the European Socialists are translated into English this work will be found of value to Socialists who may be interested in municipal betterment. As such it is well worth the study of the numerous newly elected Socialist municipal officers. Indeed, it is safe to say that the only chance there will ever be of any really effective work along the lines here sketched out will come through the election of Socialists who will not be restrained by fear of injuring property interests. But when this is done it will not be called philanthropy, but justice.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Darrow's "Resist Not Evil."

No recent sociological work by an American writer has excited more comment and discussion than "Resist Not Evil," by Clarence S. Darrow. Mr. Darrow has something to say, he is not afraid to say it, and he writes delightful English, making it a pleasure to read anything from his pen. The impression made by his book upon the conventional defender of capitalism is well shown in the following extract from the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

"This is a startling arraignment of the doctrine of force and punishment, the attitude taken by the author being that of a rank Socialist. The same old theme is in evidence; that certain men calling themselves rulers, having forcibly seized the earth and desiring to keep possession of its treasures forever, have made certain rules and regulations to this end, and when the so-called disinherited have reached out to obtain the means of life, they have been met with these arbitrary measures and lodged in jail. . . . The book begins with an attack on the nature of the state, then taking up armies and navies in the same spirit scores their very existence as a power for evil, and treats all forms of civil government with like condemnation. But the portion which deals with crime and punishment occupies the greater part of the volume, and is a rabid assault on every known agency for the protection of law and order and the enforcement of discipline. . . . The closing chapter, on the right treatment of violence, is drawn on the regulation 'how to make everybody happy' lines usually adopted by the Socialist in his dreams of a perfect world, where laziness, incompetency and degeneracy will share alike with honest labor and brains. The keynote of the volume lies in extreme exaggeration of existing conditions, and visionary theories for their betterment."

Other newspaper men, who apparently are more free to express their own opinions, comment as follows:

Hartford Times: "Mr. Darrow has made an extremely ingenious and interesting book in defense of the doctrine he has taken for his title. That much must be granted by those who dissent most positively from his teaching, which is in substance a sublimated anarchism not in the least the kind that throws bombs and wars on society—that which holds courts and laws unnecessary."

Paul Thielemann, in Denver Post: "I must say frankly that influ-

lieve the doctrine of non-resistance is just as impossible as the exploded doctrine of black slavery, but I admire Darrow's book for its simplicity of style, and I believe that it will come very close to being a classic. Darrow says he got it all from Tolstoi, but if the little book is great the credit should all be Darrow's. . . . But I can't help not suppressing the amusement I always feel over the Anglo-Saxon who seriously espouses the Oriental theory of non-resistance. In spite of himself he is pugnacious and warlike. One can't get over the impression that Mr. Darrow would fight with the utmost determination to uphold his belief."

Buffalo Courier: "The book is logical, if not practical, and there is much in it to set one thinking."

"Indianapolis Sentinel: "Although we do not fully agree in his conclusion, Mr. Darrow has evolved a theory with much plausibility, and his book should be read by every candid student of social and economic problems. He makes an extreme statement, but there is much truth and some justice in what he states. As a lawyer, fighting what he conceives to be the battle of the weak against the strong, Mr. Darrow is a living contradiction to his own doctrine of 'Resist Not Evil,' but this inconsistency need not be charged as militating against his sincerity. A man may know and value ideals while not able to practice them. And the reader of Mr. Darrow's book should not conceive him to be a hypocrite or a dreamer, but accept him as being honest and sincere, however different his views are from the orthodox treatment of the subject."

St. Paul Dispatch: "However one may disagree with him, a positive enjoyment is possible from the study of the subject, with Mr. Darrow's aid."

Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph: "The author displays an earnestness of style and originality of treatment that gives his work enhanced value."

Minneapolis Times: "It is, first of all, a volume very simple in its line of argument, and as clear as crystal in its style. Whether you believe or not in Mr. Darrow's theory, you will like his method of unfolding it. . . . The possibilities of human nature are always beyond its probabilities on the side of improvement, which is a reason why the disbelievers of the 'Resist Not Evil' idea should be slow in criticism, and really enjoy this little book, whose ideas have been the favorite ones of the greatest reformers of the world, but have never, it is safe to say, been more fully expanded in such simple and transparent English."

To conclude, we will quote from one Socialist review, that of the Toiler, Terre Haute, Ind.: "In his exposition of government and all its auxiliary agencies, including the military and judicial functions, the author stands squarely on the Socialist position which proclaims them to be instruments which derive their source from the capitalist system and are used to keep in subjection the working class and to preserve class rule. His criticism of criminal law and the failure of its application to secure the results sought is a splendid contribution to the nature of revolt and will be read with pleasure by those who promote the book. One is at a loss to understand how one with such

a keen perception of the basis of capitalism as Darrow possesses can stay in the mire of capitalist politics."

"Resist Not Evil" is a beautifully printed volume of 179 pages, daintily bound in extra silk cloth with white stamping, and the price, including postage to any address, is 75 cents, to our stockholders 45 cents.

Sombart's "Socialism and the Social Movement."

This book has already been mentioned in these pages, but its great importance justifies us in giving it additional space at this time. It is a work which is really indispensable to any Socialist who intends to try to explain Socialism to others, either with voice or pen. It is not in itself a propaganda work, but rather a scientific examination of the working class movement by one standing apart from it. Nevertheless it is one of the clearest expositions of scientific Socialism ever written. The best informed Socialist will find that it will aid him in formulating his ideas in a way to carry conviction to others, while the average Socialist who has read little beside newspapers will find his ideas wonderfully broadened and cleared by a careful study of this book.

There are eight chapters, entitled as follows: "Whence and Whither," "Concerning Utopian Socialism," "The Antecedents of the Social Movement," "The Development of National Peculiarities," "Karl Marx," "The Trend Toward Unity," "Tendencies of the Present," "Lessons." There is also an appendix showing a chronicle of the social movement from the year 1750, in four parallel columns, one giving events in France, one in Germany, one in England, and one in the international organization.

The book contains 216 large and beautifully printed pages and is bound in extra vellum cloth, with gold stamping. The price is one dollar, with the usual discount to stockholders. We will mail a copy free to any one sending us the name of a new subscriber to The International Socialist Review for one year with one dollar. If you wish the book at once, and will undertake to find a subscriber later, send one dollar and we will send you the book, and will also, if requested, inclose a subscription post card good for The Review one year to a new name.

The Communist Manifesto.

One might be a certain sort of a Christian without having read the Sermon on the Mount, but the chances are against such a Christian having a very clear idea of what his religion means. It is also true that one might be a certain sort of a Socialist without having read the Communist Manifesto, but the chances are considerably more than even against his having an adequate conception of what Socialism means. Not that Socialism rests on the authority of the Communist Manifesto or any other book. Merely that the principles of Socialism were first stated in the Communist Manifesto, and so admirably stated that this has for more than fifty years been recognized as the best brief exposition of Socialism. To try to understand Socialism without studying the "Manifesto" is an absurd waste of energy. The book contains only sixty-four pages, but its importance and influ-

ence are not measured by its bulk. It has heretofore been published only in extremely unattractive editions, but it is now offered by our co-operative publishing company in a dainty pocket edition, with flexible cover, stamped in gold, at ten cents, and in a substantial library edition, printed on heavy paper with wide margins, and bound in silk cloth, for fifty cents. Either edition will be mailed on receipt of price, with the usual discounts to stockholders in our co-operative company.

The Republic of Plato.

The third book of this world-classic is now offered to American readers in a daintily printed edition, uniform in style, with the first and second books previously published. The translator is Alexander Kerr, professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. His work on the first two books has been enthusiastically commended by scholars, since he has taken the utmost pains not only to reproduce the thought of the original with absolute fidelity, but to do this in clear and strong English, easy of comprehension by those who are not Greek students.

Plato's Republic is the earliest and also the ablest of the countless attempts to formulate an ideal scheme for reconstructing society. Written 2300 years ago, it is still far in advance of most that passes for philosophic discussion of ethics and statecraft. Moreover, it is one of the greatest examples of the Socratic form of argument, and is thus indispensable to any student desiring to reach a broad comprehension of the philosophic basis of Socialism. The first book is mainly taken up with a discussion of the nature of justice, and it may be a surprise to some readers to know that in this product of the fourth century before the Christian era there is a clear recognition of the truth that in a state founded on slavery, like that of Athens then or America to-day, "justice" means action in conformity with the interest of the strongest, the rulers.

It should not be inferred, however, that the "Republic" is in any sense a Socialist work. Not only is it true that there was no possible foundation for scientific Socialism before the invention of modern machinery; it is also true that Plato was distinctly an aristocrat, and was squarely opposed to allowing the workers any share in the government. But after all allowance has been made for this, it should still be remembered that Plato's "Republic" is a work of genius of the highest order, one of the world's greatest books, and one which until now has been the exclusive property of the leisure class.

The second and third books are mainly taken up with a discussion of the system of public education to be followed in the ideal state. Each book is in a sense complete in itself, yet there is a close logical connection between the three. They are published in uniform style, 15 cents each, with the usual discounts to stockholders in our co-operative company.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., Publishers
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1903.

NO. 10.

The Taff Vale Decision and Incorporation of Trade Unions.

THE striking feature of the current press comment on the Taff Vale decision is the dense editorial ignorance of the elementary legal principles involved in the case. The capitalistic editors are jubilant over the fact that a way has at last been discovered to curb "the tyranny of the trade-unions": just compel them by law to incorporate so that they may be mulcted in damages. A great alarm is exhibited in the labor press over the "impending danger to trade-unionism" from incorporation.

The irrelevancy of all this clatter must be clear to any one who will take the trouble to familiarize himself with the law on the subject. Let us first see what were the facts in the Taff Vale case.

A preliminary injunction was obtained by the Taff Vale Railway Company against the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, restraining the union from picketing. The injunction was based on the English act, which, though exempting trade unions and strikes from the operation of the conspiracy law, expressly prohibits what is termed "besetting" of persons who are willing to take the places of striking workmen. An appeal from the order was taken to the Court of Appeal. On the merits of the controversy, it was argued on behalf of the union that "picketing" was not unlawful; not relying, however, upon this defense, counsel for the union attempted to defeat the injunction upon the technical ground that a trade union, being neither a corporation nor a partnership, could not be sued in court. The Court of Appeal sustained this technical objection and dissolved the injunction, without passing upon the right of picketing. As should have been expected, an appeal was taken by the railway company to the House of Lords. The right of picketing was not in issue before the House of Lords. The only question upon this appeal

was, Can a trade union be sued? The answer was in the affirmative, and that was the only logical answer that any sane person, except a technical lawyer, could have anticipated. (a)

I do not wish to be uncharitable with the counsel for the Amalgamated Society. A lawyer wants to win his case, by a square fight if he can, by a technical trick if he must. In this case a further excuse for counsel can be found in the fact that they were sustained in one court and were therefore justified in trying to work their trick higher up. But it is folly for a trade union, which is fighting for the rights of labor, to dodge the issue when it is taken into court. The main question in the case was the right of picketing, and it was to the union's interest to have this point decided by the courts one way or another. Instead of that the union allowed its counsel to sidetrack the vital issue by absurd technicalities.

The contention of its counsel practically meant that a trade union, like the king, "can do no wrong;" no matter what wrong it might actually perpetrate, it could not be prosecuted in court. Had the law been held to permit of such an anomaly, the defect would sooner or later have been cured by legislation. The trade unions may boast of a great deal of influence in English politics, but not enough to secure them such an immunity as no citizen or corporation enjoys under the modern theory of equality before the law.

Let us forget for a moment that the decision was rendered by the House of Lords—could any other decision be rendered by a Socialist judge? The spectacle of the Knights of Labor Cutters' Union and A. F. of L. Boot and Shoe Workers' Union striking and scabbing against each other is not of a nature to encourage making a labor union the sole judge of right or wrong in its own case.

The Taff Vale decision has laid down no new rule of law. As pointed out in one of the opinions in the Taff Vale case, (b) the practice of the courts of equity has long since established a method of procedure against an unincorporated association, by what is known as a "representative action." Such an action may be maintained in the following cases:

"(1) Where the question is one of common or general interest, and one or more sue, or defend for the benefit of the whole; (2) where the parties form a voluntary association for public or private purposes, and those, who sue, or defend, may fairly be presumed to represent the rights and interests of the whole; (3)

(a) See Testimony of Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich on incorporation of trade unions, given before the Industrial Commission prior to the Taff Vale decision. Report of the Industrial Commission, vol. XIV., p. 159.

(b) 1. Taff Vale Railway Company vs. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, A. C. (1901), 426.

where the parties are very numerous, and although they have, or may have separate, distinct interests, yet it is impracticable to bring them all before the court." (a)

"The like doctrine applies to cases, where there are many persons, belonging to a voluntary association, against whom the suit is brought. In such cases, it is sufficient that such a number of proprietors are brought before the court, as may fairly represent the interests of all, where those interests are of a common character and responsibility." (b)

In the United States suits against unincorporated associations were authorized very early by statute. In Pennsylvania the courts were given, by the act of 15th June, 1836, sec. 15,, "the supervision and control of all unincorporated societies or associations." (c)

In New York the equity rules quoted above were, in 1847, embodied in the Code of Procedure, sec. 119, corresponding to sec. 448 of the present Code of Civil Procedure, which contains the following clause:

"Where the question is one of a common or general interest of many persons; or where the persons, who might be parties, are very numerous, and it may be impracticable to bring them all before the court, one or more may sue or defend for the benefit of all."

The same provision was reproduced from the New York Code in the codes or revised statutes of many other States (d) and in the British Judicature Act of 1873.

Under these statutes actions were maintained against the Knights of Labor, the United Garment Workers of America, the Essex Trade Council of Newark, N. J., and numerous other unincorporated trade unions. (e)

These legal details may, perhaps, appear wearisome to the lay reader, but I deem them necessary to convince the trade-unionist and his Socialist sympathizer that a trade union can gain no immunity from judgments by fighting shy of incorporation. Very soon they may be awakened from this fancied security to the realization of the fact that an unincorporated trade-union is exposed to attack where incorporation would offer some measure of protection. It will be remembered that in a recent injunction case a

(a) Story, Equity Pleading, Sec. 97.

(b) Ibid., Sec. 116.

(c) Stevick, Unincorporated Association, p. 5.

(d) California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 382; Civil Code of Kentucky, Sec. 25; Revised Statutes of Ohio, Sec. 5008; see also Codes of Indiana (Sec. 270), Colorado (Sec. 12), Nebraska (Sec. 43), Kansas (Sec. 38), etc.

(e) Wicks vs. Monihan, 130 N. S. 932; Sinsheimer vs. United Garment Workers of America, 5 Misc. 448; s. c. 77 Hun. 215; Mayer vs. Journeymen Stonecutters' Association, 47 N. J. Eq. 519; Barr vs. Essex Trade Council, 53 N. J. Eq. 101.

rabid capitalistic judge advised the attorney for the corporation to amend the complaint by inserting a demand for money damages and threatened to have every striker stripped of his last suit of clothes in satisfaction of the judgment. From a circular letter of the National Civic Federation it is learned that this utterance voices a widespread sentiment among the judiciary. The injunction has been used to break strikes, now comes the judgment for damages to break the unions. In an action against an unincorporated union judgment may be rendered against each individual member for the full amount of the plaintiff's claim, as in the case of a partnership.* In States like Massachusetts, or Illinois, where wages are only partly exempt from execution, the sheriff could levy on the wages of every individual member of the union until the judgment for hundreds of thousands of dollars (as in the Taff Vale case) were fully satisfied. In New York State, where wages are exempt, execution could be issued against the person of every member of the union and he could be locked up in jail. On the contrary, if a union is incorporated, only its corporate property could be reached by execution, not the individual property of its members.

The opposition to incorporation in quarters friendly to trade unions is therefore nothing but a Quixotic fight against windmills. The real objection to incorporation is the absence of a proper incorporation law suited to the nature of a trade union. But the defect could easily be remedied by legislative amendment. It is a fitting subject to be taken up by the Socialist representatives in the legislatures of Massachusetts and Montana and the two union Labor Congressmen from California. Backed up by the Socialist vote in the last Congressional election, any bill they may introduce on this subject is reasonably certain of passage.

Marxist.

*See Abb. N. C. 300, note, quoting Abbott's Digest of Corporation Laws.

The Economics of Socialism and the Economics of Capitalism.

NERE financial dishonesty is of very little importance in the history of civilization. Who cares whether Caesar stole or Caesar Borgia cheated? Their intellects stayed clear. The real evil that follows in the wake of a commercial dishonesty so general as ours is the intellectual dishonesty it generates. One need not mind stealing, but one must cry out at people whose minds are so befuddled that they do not know theft when they see it.

—J. J. Chapman in "Causes and Consequences."

The sanctions for Socialism are to be found in a study of economics. What these economic truths are which underlie the socialistic philosophy we shall endeavor to point out. We claim that they are fundamental and vital, and that they are impelling the movement onward with irresistible force.

These underlying truths are two: first, all wealth is the product of labor; second, labor is entitled to its product. That all the world's wealth is the product of labor does any one doubt? Let us briefly scan the range of human effort and see if we observe any exception. Labor tills the earth, builds our railroads, mines and transports the coal, gathers the ores, builds and operates the smelters, moulds and refines the metals, invents and constructs every machine from the simplest to the most intricate. Labor plans and erects our factories, labor fires the boilers, operates every machine and conveys the product to our doors. The energy of man, in the last analysis, is the creator of all wealth.

It is a self-evident truth also that labor is entitled to the full benefit of its creative effort. Does labor under our present system receive its entire product? We assert that it does not. To make this point clear it is only necessary to refer to a few of our capitalistic methods.

Our attention is not infrequently called to the schemers of Wall street who manipulate the stock market or to the speculators of Chicago who corner the grain market and who on occasions secure enormous profits thereby, without having performed an iota of productive labor. Note also the English and the Continental holders of our bonds and stocks, to whom millions of dollars are annually sent from our earnings without their having contributed one minute's thought even to production in our industries.

It is a matter of common observation that many revel in wealth and luxurious living who neither sow nor reap; that there is a multitude who derive support who do not contribute either by mental or muscular exertion to the production of anything. It is

also a matter of common observation that there is a much larger number who toil incessantly for a scanty subsistence. That labor does not receive its full reward is evident from this one fact alone, viz., that many who perform no labor receive such large returns from the product of labor.

The natural inquiry at this point is how is wealth diverted to the use of others than those who create it? This leads us to a consideration of the economics of Capitalism.

Surplus wealth in whatever it may consist, whether foods, clothing, household goods, machinery, or as represented ordinarily by our medium of exchange-money, possesses no inherent power to produce more wealth.

We grant that surplus wealth may represent the extra exertion or the self-denial of an individual, in which case he has the right to use that surplus when and as he pleases. Our contention is that surplus wealth has no power to add to, or multiply itself. To illustrate: a baker besides providing for himself and family, may have by economy succeeded in accumulating a surplus, say of one hundred loaves. Have these one hundred loaves power to become one hundred and ten loaves? A boat maker or a wagon maker by working overtime may have created a surplus of two boats or two wagons. Have these two boats or two wagons capacity to become more boats or more wagons? Surely not. On the contrary, wealth once created soon commences to deteriorate. The wealth of the world would soon disappear were it not continually recreated by labor.

A piece of silver coined into our medium of exchange, money—one dollar for instance—is not capable of producing anything, not even more money. It possesses neither brain, muscle or reproductive organs; how, then, can money create anything?

Let us formulate our inquiry in the terms of mathematics, thus: one hundred dollars plus nothing are how many? We say plus nothing because wealth in any form has no power to add more than nothing to itself, hence we state one hundred plus nothing are how many? The answer is one hundred, not one hundred and four or one hundred and six. But, you reply, one hundred dollars placed in a bank for a year amounts at the end of that time to one hundred and four dollars. This is equivalent to saying that one hundred plus nothing is one hundred and four—an absurdity. Take a twenty-dollar gold piece, place it where you will, leave it as long as you wish, it is never more than a twenty-dollar gold piece.

In our industries we manipulate our medium of exchange—money—contrary to all the truths of mathematics, and herein do we see the reason why labor does not receive its full reward. We insist through the device of usury that wealth, as represented by

capital, shall have power to multiply itself—that one hundred plus nothing shall amount to one hundred and four, one hundred and six, or one hundred and ten. Rockefeller insists that one hundred plus nothing shall amount to one hundred and forty-five. Thus is labor exploited.

Usury is a form of injustice arbitrarily imposed by the strong on the weak in the same manner as was human slavery. For ages it has been sanctioned by society, and to this day is approved by the general sentiment of the community. However, the truly thoughtful, interested in economics, are coming to recognize the injustice of usury in all its forms and to expose its fallacy.

It is asked, if through the device of usury, wealth which should in equity belong to its producer is diverted to the capitalist, why is the process termed exploitation? Is not the result in effect equivalent to robbery? In other words, is not exploitation a form of robbery legalized? It is charged that Rockefeller, who in his oil industry practically insists, through usury, that one hundred plus nothing shall equal one hundred and forty-five or one hundred and forty-eight, is a "robber" of the community. Rockefeller's methods of exploitation may differ in degree, but is he any more truly a "robber" than is the successful merchant or manufacturer who by careful business methods succeeds in clearing a profit on his invested capital of, say, six, eight or ten per cent? And he in turn, is he any more truly a "robber" than is the laborer who, from his scanty wage of one dollar and a half per day has succeeded in saving, say, fifty dollars, on which he draws four per cent interest through some savings bank? Is it not in a sense true that the only members of society who are not "robbers" are those who have not been able to accumulate a fund on which to exact usury, and is it through any intentional virtue on their part that they are not "robbers?"

To ask these questions is to answer them. For it is evident to the thoughtful that our present capitalistic system is a system of piracy, the members of the community pitted against each other, with this result—the greatest measure of success to the most cunning or the most fortunately situated.

These conditions peculiar to our economic system cannot be remedied by any individual or by a minority group of individuals. Our relief must come through a general movement of society organized to this end. It is this deplorable Capitalistic System which the Socialist seeks to replace with the Co-operative Commonwealth.

This conflict between Socialism and Capitalism may well be said to be a conflict between economic truth and economic error. The economic truths underlying the Socialistic Philosophy, are, as

stated: first, labor creates all wealth; second, labor is entitled to the wealth it creates—the whole of it.

The economic error underlying Commercialism, and directly antagonistic to the economic truths of Socialism, is that of usury. As previously shown, it is through this device of usury under its various forms of interest, rent, profit, dividends, that labor is exploited.*

At this point let us briefly consider that condition of stagnation in industry known as "hard times," when our factories are silent and laborers out of employment. Let us trace these effects to cause.

First, we may have a varying precipitating cause, such as lack of confidence, a close money market, etc. An underlying or more substantial cause is that of machine production. Through the use of power machinery we produce a larger volume of manufactured goods than we can consume during a given time—the markets becoming overstocked and the mills compelled to close. While the warehouses are filled with goods, the consumers—under ordinary circumstances unable to satisfy their wants—are now, with income curtailed or entirely cut off, able to consume far less than their normal amount; this condition of stagnation is in consequence greatly prolonged.

A deeper underlying cause is seen in the fact that the machinery of production is largely in the hands of the capitalist who controls the product of labor. The laborer is consequently shut out from its use and we have as a result destitution and starvation in the midst of plenty. These implements of production were wrested from the hands of the producers in the evolution of industry from hand to power production. Were these implements under the control of the producers, they would be operated as needed to supply their wants; there would be no serious shortage or overstock of manufactured goods?

Pushing our inquiry still further we discover that the incentive to production on the part of the capitalist who controls the machinery is not one of utility, but that of profit; interest on capital, dividends. And here, in this prominent feature of our Capitalistic System, Usury, we find the fundamental cause of our periods of business depression. In fact, this false and artificial factor in our present system is the real cause of a train of economic ills such as long hours of daily toil, low wages, poverty, distress and crime. It is the mission of Socialism to abolish usury and thus put a stop to all forms of exploitation.

Through the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth we find the only practical method to accomplish this end. Were

*We concede as legitimate that portion of rent necessary to keep a property in repair.

we to pass laws abolishing usury, and were it possible to enforce them, the remedy would be worse than the disease. Under our present system profit is the incentive to industry; were this prohibited production would be likely to cease, we would be in danger of starvation, surely we would suffer from cold, for we cease to produce, to manufacture or to transport merchandise as soon as our efforts become unprofitable.

Socialism takes over to collective ownership, the mines, the machinery and the productive forces of the nation to be operated by and for the people—eventually without interest, rent or profit to anyone. The Co-operative Commonwealth merges all the productive forces of the nation into one grand corporation in which each worker holds one share and to which he contributes his portion of creative effort; a corporation from which he receives in return the full product of one man's labor.

We should as soon expect to see a hungry man refuse to eat as a laboring man refuse to become a Socialist when he comprehends the principles involved.

We repeat, Socialism is a practical movement on the part of organized society to abolish usury and thus put a stop to the exploitation of labor.

The entire history of the social evolution of the human race has been a long drawn out, agonizing struggle for a more harmonious adjustment of the individual to the social whole. Socialism is a continued, *conscious and intelligent* movement of the social units in the same direction and is based on the modern conception of the "perfect solidarity of the interests of all mankind." The Co-operative Commonwealth is the crowning glory, the blossom and fruitage of social development. On the foundation of a just and abundant economic support for all, it furnishes a base for a marvelous growth for the higher aspirations of man.

A thoughtful and able writer, Isador Ladoff, in his book, "The Passing of Capitalism," says, "To be called a Socialist is to receive the highest compliment one man can pay to another; to be a true Socialist is the highest distinction a man can attain on earth."

RECAPITULATION.

Our argument is intended to show,

- 1st. That all wealth is the product of labor.
- 2d. That in equity labor is entitled to its product.
- 3d. That a large portion of wealth is diverted from labor, which creates it.
- 4th. That this wealth thus diverted is diverted through the device of Usury.

Wealth possessing no inherent power of increase, it follows that any additions to capital through the device of Usury must

come from the creations of labor and result, practically, in its enslavement (wage slavery).

5th. We have stated that this exploitive system was forcibly imposed by the strong over the defenceless, and that it is to-day sanctioned and maintained by general consent.

With the exception of a few thoughtful individuals, both the capitalist and laboring classes are not yet conscious of the injustice of Usury. This is owing to our capitalistic environment and training which have seriously befogged the mind and obscured the principles involved.

6th. We have maintained that the conflict between Socialism and Capitalism is a conflict between economic truth and economic error.

7th. We have contended that it is the mission of Socialism, eventually, to abolish Usury.

Finally, this conflict can have but one outcome. Like all previous conflicts between truth and error, economic truth must inevitably prevail and the Co-operative Commonwealth be inaugurated.

Charles C. Hitchcock.

The Great Strike on the Railroads of Holland.



WE thought we were far behind in the International labor movement. The "great industry" has very slowly developed in Holland. The domination of the small businesses, the anarchist propaganda, the power of religious ideas, the dull indifference of the mass—all these operated to hinder the development of the labor movement.

One year ago the situation appeared almost hopeless. But the proletariat is an unknown quantity. All the powers of the future slumber in it and it is as impossible for one to determine the exact moment in which water will turn into ice, or lightning to strike from the clouds, as to determine beforehand the moment of the outbreak of the accumulated revolutionary energy of the proletariat. There are critical times that pass over dully and heavily and again a little breath, an imperceptible disturbance of equilibrium suffices to gather together the clouds for a mighty tempest.

The experience of the last year has greatly changed the view of the Social Democracy in regard to the general strike. To be sure we had already given up the original position of absolutely rejecting the general strike, but the indifference and even the half conviction of the justification of this powerful means of class struggle has grown in just the degree that the idea of this weapon has entered into Social Democracy. Even if we consider the general strike of *all* laborers as sought after by the Anarchists, Utopian, and if we reject the idea that the general strike is the *only* weapon, the panacea of the proletariat (for whither shall come the necessary organization, training and discipline for the general strike without the experience gained in the daily political and economic struggle?), we have, nevertheless, learned to recognize it as a powerful weapon whose application we must learn to study and which will be more and more favorably looked upon by all Socialists.

The general strike of the Dutch railroad workers whose first, and perhaps only, act has just concluded may be considered here as a typical case. It began as a pure expression of solidarity by the strikers, but by its conclusion it had led not alone the assisted comrades, but the railroad workers themselves to a full victory, and as a result had brought to maturity another strike, that of the Amsterdam municipal workers; that in all probably will be crowned with a similar result.

For several years the Amsterdam Dock and Transport workers have had a strong economic organization. Out of numerous raw elements the principles of organization and solidarity have

been disciplined into battalions obedient to the will of the majority and their representatives. Truly battalions for from their very foundations battling has been the life of this organization. It is made up of many trades including the "Bootwerker," the warehouse workers and the people who are engaged in the handling of goods around the numerous water-ways, and warehouses, such as dock laborers, etc.

According to the decision of the international congress of transport workers held at Paris these bodies were combined into a federation. In 1903 there was another collision between these unions and the warehouse corporations, known in Dutch as the "Veemen." The strike ended with the victory of the warehouse workers, who were assured among other things that from now on they would never be compelled to work with nonunion laborers.

One of the "Veemen" did not keep this promise, but at once introduced nonunionists, which were favored in every possible way. Naturally this did not please the organized workers. It soon came to an active disagreement and one fine morning the warehouse workers of this "Veem" laid down their work and demanded the discharge of two nonunion workers. When this demand was refused the workers concerned unanimously ceased work. A freighting firm introduced fifty-six strike breakers, whereupon the representatives of the federated unions met and resolved that no union man should touch any of the goods handled by the strike breakers. These goods were declared "dead." As the fifty-six strike breakers were not discharged this blockade hung over the warehouses of all the "Veemen" who handled goods for the boycotted firms.

Meanwhile new vessels were continually coming in loaded with wares for the boycotted firms, and so the strike continued to grow.

A complication of much greater significance very soon appeared, owing to the following circumstances: One dock in Amsterdam is set apart for bulky goods, as for example Spanish iron ore, to be loaded directly from the ships into the railroad cars. At this dock hundreds of railroad workers, switchmen, machinists, etc., are engaged in the assemblage of the goods destined for Germany. The question now arose: what will these men do if they must handle cars loaded by strike breakers? To be sure this question did not concern the federated dock laborers but the union of the railroad men.

In contrast to the dock workers, whose history—at least during the last few years has been a succession of victories—the railroad workers have been able to assert themselves only under great difficulties. With the rise of the first Socialist movement the first organization of the railroad workers had also arisen, but em-

employers and anarchistic influences split them. After a very long apathy we see them now, like the whole Socialist movement, again gaining in strength. In the first place the machinists and firemen formed a very strong organization. The conductors and other trade workers followed and joined with the former in a federation, and finally the whole movement found a new and firm center in a union of the governmental employes, which in Utrecht had developed from an almost imperceptible beginning to a powerful fighting organization.

Now, on the 29th of January, when the switchmen were ordered to handle boycotted cars, they refused service and their action was followed by the whole 500 railroad workers who were occupied on this dock, and who also laid down their work. The representatives of the unions involved met with the directors of the Holland railroad corporations, but without result, so that the same evening, in an assemblage of railroad workers in Amsterdam, the strike was decided upon by a vote of 702 to 28, because the directors had refused their demands. The same conclusion was reached on the same night by numerous assemblages in many larger and smaller cities.

The strike was declared as a purely sympathetic strike. To be sure a few demands for the betterment of their own condition were made—this was very natural—but the motive of it from the beginning to end was that of helping the threatened comrades in other branches, and on the attainment of this end they again took up their labor.

Fortunately for the extension of the strike, especially among the unorganized workers amounting to 9,000 out of 17,000 railroad workers, there was a long accumulated hatred against the railroad corporations, based upon low wages and inhumanly long hours of labor and a determination to crush out every germ of organization by general rules. The federation was led by "anti-parliamentary" Socialists, while the railroad workers were led by Social Democrats and the larger proportion of their membership were Social Democrats. Both of these otherwise bitterly fighting factions co-operated harmoniously in this case, and this co-operation brought about the grandest results.

On the day after the meeting the unions were once more approached by the employers. By that time there was a very noticeable stoppage of traffic and the employers took on a new tone. First concession: recognition of the organization from now on. This in itself was an important victory. Further: in the disputed dock nothing more shall be done, with full compensation to the strikers, until the conclusion of the strike. Finally, and this was the most important of all, employers agreed to request the govern-

ment to abolish the article of the railroad regulations which compelled the railroad employes under all conditions to accept goods for transportation. Meanwhile, the strike continued in and around Amsterdam. If the government denied the suspension then the strike would extend at one stroke over the whole country.

In the evening assemblages were again held. One may imagine what rejoicings there were. Victory was in sight. Amidst these rejoicings all the unions pledged their support, and at midnight every depot in Amsterdam was vacant. The next morning not a train came into Amsterdam. A zone was created into which no locomotive dare come. Telegrams in great numbers poured into the headquarters of the railroad workers from the railroad employes in all parts of the country pledging themselves to lay down their work at the first signal. In many places the strikes broke out spontaneously.

The great question was now what will the government do? Will they agree to the suspension of this article and grant to the laborers that the wagons filled with boycotted goods shall not be touched nor switched nor sent through to Germany? Feverish suspense reigned. The directors of the railroad, together with a committee of the workers, had gone to the Hague to consult with the ministers. Meanwhile the military was poured into Amsterdam from all directions. Disturbing news items were heard to the effect that trains were to be forced through the guarded zone. But even before the dispatches announcing this decision had been sent to the different organizations, the answer of the general directors of the railroads came: "We grant to your members the right not to switch the wares of 'Veemen' whose dock laborers are on strike and maintain all the other concessions of yesterday." Everything was won. The next day at four great assemblages of the laborers the decision was adopted to again take up work. The indisputable result of this battle was a complete victory for the dock workers. The strike breakers were sent home, all strikers were reinstated, their right not to work with strike breakers expressly recognized, and the other points in dispute submitted to a court of arbitration.

But the battle, however, was not closed even with this. The railroad workers still stood with their weapons at their sides. Everyone waited to see what the government would do. They had avoided any direct answer to the railroad corporation, declared the question to be a private affair of the railroad, and refused to interfere. But from the bourgeois standpoint such a position cannot be maintained. The bourgeois press of all political complexions shrieked for laws against the railroad workers and demanded the bringing in of the militia to serve as strike breakers.

On the other hand, the labor organization grew as never be-

fore, and the willingness for battle was greatly increased by the result of the election and by the result of the railroad strike, so that just now the thousands of municipal laborers in Amsterdam are threatening to strike. The government will soon be driven out of its passive position. But whether it will enact any oppressive legislation or attempt to legally regulate the wage contract, or whether it will seek to split the labor union of the railroad workers with the help of the unorganized laborers and the Catholic Labor unions, no one can tell as yet.

Little consolation can be derived from the fact that the government has called out the reserves for the two years past so that all the garrisons have three times their customary strength. Amsterdam especially is bristling with soldiers. The Social Democracy as a party has not yet entered into the battle—not even the Parliamentary fraction—since the Chamber has not yet met. To be sure our comrades, and especially the members of the Chamber, have everywhere been fighting in the front ranks. Now it must depend upon the attitude of the government as to what the party will do. Domela Nieuwenhuis and the Anarchists sought to make capital out of the strike, but they have scarcely been able to obtain many results. For it was just the firm, well-built organization against which they have always clamored, to which the successful result of the strike is due.

For the carrying out of such a sudden and unexpected extensive strike requires a schooling, and an organization such as is seldom to be found to-day. Now I would certainly not say that such a schooling and organization was already existing in Holland to-day.

But if the weapon of the general strike is to be utilized, then the organization must be so built up that this weapon will stand ready for instant use. For the certainty of success in a general strike lies in its suddenness. Ever more numerous and greater will become the great strikes and outbreaks of this character which shake the social life of the nation to its foundation. It is not the case of the theory forming the reality, but the reality being recognized and grasped by the theory. Most important of all, we see similar phenomena in Belgium, Sweden, France, Austria, America and Switzerland. The antagonisms grow sharper and greater. The range of single struggles between capital and labor gains in extent and the great general strikes draw into the struggle bodies of otherwise indifferent laborers.

Herman Gorter in the Neue Zeit.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

Enrico Ferri.

ALL American Socialists will be glad to learn that Comrade Enrico Ferri is making arrangements to visit this country during the next year. Whether he will come or not depends largely upon whether a lecture tour can be arranged for him. Every effort should be made to insure his appearance and the attention of French and Italian speaking Socialists should be called to this opportunity to secure the services of perhaps the foremost exponent of Socialism now living. The following sketch of his life will be of interest to those who may be assisting in the arrangements for dates of Comrade Ferri's lectures.

Enrico Ferri was born at S. Benedetto, Po. Mantova, on the 25th of February, 1856. He was a pupil at the Lycee of Mantova under the celebrated Professor Roberto Ardigo and also at the University of Bologna under the well known Professor of Criminal law, Pietro Ellero. In July, 1877, he took the diploma of Doctor of Law, and in 1878, one year later, was sent—after competition—to Contmier, by the Italian Government, to study criminal law at the University of Pisa, residing with the chief of the classical school, Francesco Carrara.

In 1878, the same year, the publication of some works gained for him a scholarship at the expense of the Government to the University of Paris.

In 1879 at Paris he studied and illustrated his "*Etudes par la Criminalte en France de 1826 a 1878*," and did other work in Criminology.

In 1880 he was private docent at the University of Forino and a pupil of the celebrated Cesare Lombroso, going with him to the prisons and to the Asylums for Aliens to study criminal anthropology. In 1881 he was nominated professor at the University of Bologna, where he made the notes upon the "*Nouveaux Horizons de la Justice Penale*," which in the first edition consisted of 150 pages and which afterwards became his fundamental work on Criminal Sociology, the fourth edition, issued in 1901, containing 1,000 pages. This work has been translated into French, German, English and Spanish.

From 1882 to 1886 he was professor at the University of Siena. In 1886, almost before he had reached the necessary age of thirty years, he was elected deputy at Gonzaga—Mantova—and was re-elected five times, and at the last election in 1900 was elected in two districts—Ganzara and Rarennna. He was a candidate in thirty-two districts, gaining the greatest number of votes

in all Italy, of all the 508 elected deputies. From 1886 to 1893 he was a Radical Deputy on "the extreme left."

In 1893 he was chosen to represent the Socialist party at the Congress of Reggio Emilia. From 1886 to 1891 he was privat docent at the University of Rome and in 1891 was nominated professor (without examination) at the University of Pisa. He had now become the successor of the celebrated head of the Classical school of metaphysics and criminal law—Francesco Carrara—one of the founders of the classic school of anthropology and criminal sociology. But in 1896, after entering the Socialist party, the Government took away his chair at the University of Pisa and he was compelled to return as private docent to Rome, where he now is.

Since 1896 he has been a tireless worker for Socialism throughout all Italy, speaking over one hundred times each year. During the exceptional rule of Crispi he was condemned for the propaganda of Socialism to seventy-five days' imprisonment.

In 1895 he was professor of Criminal Sociology at the New University at Brussels, where he gave his series of fifteen lessons for two years. In the year 1901 he gave lectures on Criminal Sociology at the University of Amsterdam, and also on Scientific Sociology at the University of Delft, Holland.

In 1899 and 1900, when General Pellona proposed the exceptional laws which revoked the constitutional liberties—after the events of 1898—he directed the two companies of obstructionists against the exceptional laws and led to victory the three groups of the extreme left, the Radicals, the Republicans and the Socialists.

The exceptional laws were not approved of and General Pellona was defeated, after the general elections of June, 1900, which almost doubled the number of Socialist deputies—from sixteen to twenty-one—and gave a large majority to the opposition. He published his experiences during the obstructionist campaign in a volume entitled "Parliamentary Battles." On the subject of Socialism, beside many booklets, he published the work entitled "Socialism and Modern Science," 1895, which has been translated into English, French, German, Spanish, Dutch and Servian. The second edition is in preparation. He is also the editor of the review "Le Socialisme." He is also a penal advocate and earns his livelihood in this profession.

He was the first member of the Italian Parliament to be censured and was excluded from the House for eight days in December, 1901, because, in speaking of the problem of the misery in southern Italy, he lashed the Camorra, which predominates in the communes of southern Italy. Parliament, urged on by the

members of the upper house, severely censured him, but the Italian people, and, above all, the peasants of the southern districts, made a veritable plebiscite and sent him thousands of telegrams professing themselves against the censure. In Naples, Rome, and in the southern cities he received enthusiastic demonstrations of from ten to fifteen and twenty thousand citizens during the year 1902, when he went on a propaganda tour to plead at the Court of Appeal and at the Tribunals.

Some Reflections on the French Revolution.

THE appearance of Darwin's *Origin of Species* marked the beginning of a great thought revolution, and history, in common with every department of knowledge, has felt its transforming and illuminating touch. History is no longer a chronicle of wars and intrigues, the story of states risen and decayed, a telescope through which the past is seen across a gulf, but it is now one window through which the present is seen and studied. The life of the race here and now stretches back beyond our gaze by an unbroken chain. The past lives in the present. We question history because we would know what sort of creature man is, whither he is traveling, and how he can best reach the next stage of his journey. We read history to little purpose if we do not discover some answer to these questions and some guidance for our present and future conduct.

For the student of present day thought and politics, the great spectacle known to us as the French Revolution is the most fascinating, astonishing and instructive chapter in the whole book. All the forces of social movement were then in play, all things were proposed and discussed, and centuries of change and development were compressed into five short years.

My purpose is not to rehearse the events of those years, nor to establish the correctness of any historical judgments; but rather to look upon the great drama that is going forward to-day and upon the drama of 1789 and ask, what is the lesson? How far were conditions then like conditions now, and wherein did France succeed in solving her problems, wherein did she grievously blunder?

The great need of the reader of history, as of the writer of history, is a vivid imagination. It is hard to go back and stand among the men of an earlier generation and realize the common humanity in them and in us. Very many see only the wonderful changes wrought by the 110 years that have intervened since the revolution in France and the differences between the Frenchman and the Yankee. They point to the tyranny and corruption of the French court and nobility, and ask, what has free republican America to do with these things? They look with pity on the poverty and misery of the despoiled and tax-burdened peasants and say, "Thank God, the world is well beyond all that." They shrink with horror from the frenzied cruelty of the mob, the smoke of the torch, and the blood of the guillotine, and wonder if this was a nation of fiends or mad men.

But after all a hundred years is a short time. We have ad-

vanced far in scientific discoveries and inventions, but in thought and feeling there is no corresponding difference. If in fancy we walk the streets of Paris and listen to the people talking in the clubs and cafes, we are astonished to find how much at home we feel. The same ideas were abroad that are the commonplaces of our thought and the same kinds of people might have been met among the makers of the Revolution that we know. To suppose that the Revolution was the work of monsters or mad men is to wholly misunderstand it.

In the years immediately preceding the Revolution the thing that stands out in the pages of history most clearly is the unhappy condition of the people. The Revolution was not caused by the discussions of the salons or the speculations of the philosophers; neither was it caused by the decay of religious influence or by hatred of the church. These influences and others played their part, but the fact back of the Revolution and back of the intellectual revolt was the misery and injustice that prevailed among the people. Voltaire looked upon the hopeless lot of his countrymen and was moved to pity and therefore uttered his passionate protests against the pride and selfishness of church and nobles. Rousseau saw the crushing hand of privilege, and, to justify the overthrow of a monstrous system, he conceived an ideal state of nature in which we were meant to live and to which we should return. It was the same with Diderot and the Encyclopedists, with Turgot and the physiocrats, and with all the leaders of the new thought. Their hearts were touched by the social and economic situation of the people and they sought some remedy for the poverty of the masses. I need only suggest some of the facts that are known to every reader.

First of all were the inequalities of taxation, between classes, between provinces and towns, and between individuals in any one class. The nobility and clergy were exempt from the *taille* or land tax, the clergy were exempt from the *vingtieme* or five per cent income tax, and the nobles and upper middle class secured countless other exemptions by favor or purchase. The indirect taxes were farmed out to corrupt speculators and the peasant with his scanty savings never escaped. The civil service was filled with a horde of plundering place-hunters, who bought their offices and in turn robbed and oppressed the people. Trade and manufactures were monopolies in the hands of guilds and corporations. The peasant was vexed and despoiled by feudal burdens and payments and by relentless game laws that allowed his crops to be ruined for the pleasure of the great. To the exactions of state, feudal lords and privileged guilds and monopolies, was added the support of a corrupt and oppressive church.

Agriculture was crude and unprofitable because all the profits

were seized by the privileged classes, and great tracts of land were abandoned. The people were driven by their necessities into the cities, where famine was slightly less frequent but where their presence created a new problem. Among the nobility, those in favor at court had great advantages over the less fortunate nobles; among the clergy the revenues went to the bishops and abbots, who lived in idleness and luxury and the mass of the clergy were left in poverty; in the army there were from one-fifth to one-third as many officers as privates, most of them useless of course and living apart from their commands, and, by the law of 1781, only nobles with at least four generations of noble blood were eligible to the rank of commissioned officer; and among the middle class the more able and fortunate bought exemptions and privileges that separated them from their fellows. The censorship and the criminal and civil law were enforced capriciously and by favor. In towns and cities from one-fifth to three-fourths of the people lived on alms, hundreds and thousands died of starvation, and want and misery produced crime, beggary and unthinking rebellion.

The opening words of Rousseau's *Social Contract* are, "Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains," and the Abbe Sieyes sums up the situation thus, "It is too true that you are nothing in France if you have only the protection of the common law. Without some privilege or other you must make up your mind to suffer contempt, contumely and all sorts of vexations. The unfortunate person who has no privilege of his own can only attach himself to some great man by all sorts of meanness and thus get the chance on occasion to demand the assistance of somebody."

These words not only describe the situation in France in 1789 but they describe equally well the situation in America to-day. It is folly to blind ourselves to facts and raise the cry calamity howler. What is the economic condition of the people and how does the other half live? There are many good men who will tell you that any man can be prosperous and happy in this country if he will only be honest, industrious and sober. Their advice to the poor is to stop talking about injustice, to be good, and above all be quiet and the full dinner pail shall be theirs. This sounds like the cynical advice of a despoiling taskmaster seeking to obtain security for his spoils, but that opinion would be very unjust in many cases. Too often it is the advice of people who are good and kind, but who are profoundly ignorant of the lives of the great majority. No man can come into close contact with the great masses of men or observe carefully the lives of the middle and upper classes without being conscious of controlling privileges and inequalities of opportunity.

In taxation inequality and injustice prevail to an extent that

cannot be realized save by a close study of the subject; inequality between classes, between localities and between individuals in any class. Of direct taxes the houses and farms of the poor and middle classes are assessed at nearly their full value, while the real property of great corporations and persons of influence is assessed at a small fraction of its value, and it is well within the truth to say that nine-tenths of the personal property of the rich, which constitutes such a large part of the wealth of the country, is not taxed at all. As to indirect taxes, which sustain the entire national expenditure, it is obvious that a man with \$100,000 may use twice, five times, or even ten times as much sugar or tobacco as a man with \$1,000, but that he can't possibly use a hundred times as much; much less can a man worth \$100,000,000 use 100,000 times as much, as he would have to do if he paid taxes in the same proportion. We submit to it only because we do not see the tax in the price of the goods. That the public treasury is plundered every day in useless salaries and inflated contracts is well known and only occasionally is a protest heard. We turn to the farmer and see that the profits of agriculture are seized by railroads and speculators, that farms are decreasing in value and the people are moving into the cities. We look at the merchant and see the small merchant being crowded out, and taking his place as a clerk in the great department store. We turn to the manufacturer and, with a few exceptions that are daily disappearing, we find the business in the hands of trusts and monopolies that are ever widening their control and tightening their grasp. In transportation and communication monopoly has long been established. In the professions the same concentration and destruction of independence and opportunity is testified to by all those in a position to know. Great fortunes are being piled up beyond the dreams of the imagination in the hands of the privileged few, small fortunes are being lost and small employers are becoming employes, and it is to-day a most serious problem to make any productive business a success without the advantages of wealth or some other special advantage or privilege. At the bottom thousands are being crowded into the ranks of the destitute in the midst of a land of plenty. Our production is so great that we must seek foreign markets, and yet uncounted multitudes here are hungry and cold because they can not buy. The situation suggested by mentioning the hordes of wretched dwellers in city tenements, and the armies of the unemployed that periodically surge through our cities, is only appreciated by those who acquaint themselves with how the other half lives. The facts are so painful that we would gladly be left in ignorance and allowed to think that prosperity and plenty fill the land.

Well may we repeat the words of Sieyes, "Without some privi-

lege or other you must make up your mind to suffer contempt, contumely and all sorts of vexations." Our theoretical conception that every man is free and unrestrained, that he finds his right place in life and gets all he earns or deserves, is a foolish dream that is dissipated by a little observation and reflection. It is becoming more clear that a large proportion of the people around us enter life under conditions that absolutely preclude any real chance of success. In spite of political liberty and the free play of economic forces, most people are not free, for freedom consists not so much in the absence of restrictions as in the presence of opportunity. The hard fact is that under modern changed forms the lead hand of feudalism still lies heavy on the people. "The rights of the poor, the inequality of wealth, the equalization of burdens, the abolition of privileges, the possibility of securing to all men a more equal start in life—these are questions that perplex the statesman and moralist in every modern community," and they are the same questions that the Revolution sought to answer.

This much at least seems clear, that the outlook at the dawn of the new century is profoundly interesting, that the times are pregnant with great changes, that great social and moral forces are at work, that a feeling of unrest and uncertainty and questioning is abroad everywhere, and that the problems that are unfolding themselves before our eyes surpass in magnitude and importance any that civilization has been called upon to solve.

However, I hear you say that I have given only half the picture, and that the darker half—that everywhere conditions are growing better and progress is plainly seen, that the poor are not growing poorer but are better off than ever before; and you point to the increased wages earned by the workman, to the cheapened cost of many articles he uses, to the increased comfort of his home and to widened educational facilities. I very gladly admit all this as applied to large classes of workers, although not to all. There are two sides to the situation, and encouraging facts are readily found by all who look for them. I think it is probably true that on the whole the poor are not poorer but rather less poor than formerly. I confess that I am unable to see that the case is entirely disposed of when I am shown that the returns of the worker have been multiplied by two or three, through the marvelous inventions and achievements of science in the last century, while the returns of his employer have been multiplied by a hundred. However, leaving aside that point, it may be observed that the same conditions existed in France at the time of the Revolution. There were two sides to the situation in France, also.

It is a serious error to suppose that the lot of the French people became progressively worse until they could endure it no

longer, and rose up and shook themselves free. In spite of the hopes of certain groups of Socialists, it is safe to say that revolutions do not come about in that way. The condition of the people of France fifty or seventy-five years before the revolution was far worse than at the time of the outbreak. There is a quotation from La Bruyere that is often seen in this connection. He says: "Certain savage-looking beings, male and female, are seen in the country, black, livid and sunburnt and belonging to the soil which they dig and grub with invincible stubbornness. They seem capable of articulation, and when they stand erect they display human lineaments. They are, in fact, men. They retire at night into their dens where they live on black bread, water and roots. They spare other human beings the trouble of sowing, ploughing and harvesting, and they should not be in want of the bread they have planted." Some writers have considered this overdrawn and exaggerated, so black is the picture, and it would be if meant to describe the average peasant just prior to the revolution, but the above was written in 1689, just one hundred years before, and for that period and up to the death of Louis XV. the picture is accurate. Taine estimates that in the year 1715 more than one-third of the population, or 6,000,000 persons, died of starvation or destitution. D'Argenson wrote in his journal in 1739 that in his canton of Touraine men had been living on herbage for more than a year. The Bishop of Chartres said to the king, in reply to a question, that his people ate grass like sheep and died like flies. In the cities poverty was usually less extreme than in the country, and yet in a single quarter of Paris, the Faubourg St. Antoine, and in a single month, 800 persons died of starvation in the year 1751. Widespread starvation was common and bread riots were of frequent occurrence, but at that time they were always sternly suppressed and the participants drawn and quartered, as a reminder that they must die decently and quietly and without disturbing ladies and gentlemen. If it were true that people rise in revolt when their lot becomes unendurable, then the Revolution ought to have occurred seventy-five years earlier than it did. The fact is that many reforms were effected under Louis XVI. and the general prosperity was vastly increased before the storm broke.

From the beginning of this reign the wealth of the country and the comfort of the people gradually increased. The population grew from sixteen to twenty-six millions, and the era of modern capitalistic production may be said to have begun about the middle of the eighteenth century. It was possible for the able and ambitious to rise in the world, and it was not uncommon for the upper bourgeoisie to acquire noble rank. Complaint was made that the wives of tradesmen aped the dress and manners of the

grandes dames so that it was hard to distinguish them. Some men made great fortunes in trade and speculation, the farmer general being the prototype of our kings of Wall street. He was simply the owner of valuable franchises. One writer says that the workman's chance of rising in his trade was better than now, the capital required being small, and some of the peasants by strict economy and industry were able to save enough to acquire a small body of land, so that one-fifth of the soil was held by peasant proprietors. Wall paper and paint came into use and simple artisans lived more comfortably than the first citizens of the town fifty years before. Many people of the middle class owned little villas in the suburbs and enjoyed intellectual pleasures and material luxuries. Paris was a great commercial and manufacturing city of about 800,000 people and was rapidly growing. Education was more general than formerly, there being 562 secondary schools in 1789. It must not be forgotten that many reform measures were carried, in spite of opposition, by Louis' reform ministers. Executions for religious opinions had been abolished and the criminal law reformed. Torture to compel confessions was abolished in 1780 and torture to discover accomplices in 1788. Turgot succeeded in doing away with guilds and the corvee or forced labor, restrictions on trade and labor were loosened, tax reforms were accomplished, many ornamental offices were discontinued, and food was made cheaper. In general it may be said that, with the exception of Holland and Tuscany, and possibly Prussia under Frederick the Great, France was better off materially and intellectually than the rest of the Continent. Paris was the center of the intellectual and fashionable life of Europe.

Again I hear you say that our present situation is most encouraging, because of the spirit of philanthropy abroad, the general interest manifested in the welfare of the people, and the numerous agencies that are at work for the uplifting of men. You point to the great literature of reform, to our chairs of sociology in colleges, our clubs and social settlements, the great contributions made by wealth to educational and benevolent institutions, and a hundred like facts. I gladly admit the truth of all this, but ask was not France equally to be congratulated? The awakening of a zeal for humanity was the characteristic fact of the eighteenth century. Literature and philosophy were permeated by the new spirit, it was seen in the theater and talked in the cafes and discussed with great interest in the salons. It brought forth a deluge of pamphlets, and reformers of all sorts were astir. It was a time of hope and belief in the perfectibility of man.

A revolution in America seems quite impossible. Men feel the spirit of unrest and are perplexed and uncertain as to the outcome, they feel that reforms of some sort are quite likely, but revolution

is not dreamed of. It was the same in France. All classes were interested, and some were alive to the fact that the old order was passing away, but no one anticipated revolution. When the mob pressed around the palace at Versailles on the fateful 6th of October, Louis turned to a minister and exclaimed in surprise, "Why, this is a revolt." "No, sire, this is a revolution." The people even then did not wish to overthrow the king or the old order. They believed in the king at this time and hoped that he would give them justice as they believed he desired to do. The Revolution was a surprise to all.

In fact, so far from the Revolution being prevented by reforms, by the comparative prosperity and intelligence of the people, it was exactly this comparatively advanced condition that produced the Revolution. It was this which caused the Revolution to break out in France rather than elsewhere, and in the reign of Louis XVI. rather than under Louis XV. It was this that made the people conscious of their wrongs and their possibilities, and that roused them from dull, hopeless submission to the revolt of self-conscious freemen.

What, then, may we look forward to in America? That this marvelous and rapidly increasing concentration of wealth is bringing about some great result, must be clear to all. Will the trusts increase and absorb all business and the people be reduced to the condition of industrial slaves under an aristocracy of wealth? That the American people would permanently submit to this no one believes. Will the money kings and lords of industry, then, be transformed into benevolent despots, listening to the voice of public opinion, and, with all the power in their hands, carry on the nation's business for the benefit of the people? That such power should be unselfishly used after being so selfishly grasped there is no reason to expect. Will the tide turn, then, and the great combinations be broken up and business restored to the old condition of small individual enterprises? That would be a step backward in industrial evolution, and every day makes it more certain that no such backward step is possible. Will the people becoming more and more conscious of their strength and wrongs at last rise up and overthrow the system?

From our survey of the past we may conclude that a great change was inevitable in France at that time—the accomplishment of political freedom, the birth of democracy; that nothing could have stopped that change because it was then the next step in social evolution. From our survey of the present we may conclude that a great change is inevitable now, the accomplishment of industrial and economic freedom, the "raising of the masses into the rivalry of life on terms of equality of opportunity." The goal, let it be observed, is not equality of rank or wealth or the rewards

of service, but equality of opportunity ; a social organization where none shall be rich enough to buy another, and none so poor as to be forced to sell himself to another. It is not right that all should win the same reward and honor, but it is right that all should get into the game.

So far we have traced a close parallel between the past and the present, but there is a fundamental difference. In France the change included a crisis that was attended by violence. That the change in this country will include such a crisis is not inherently impossible, but is extremely improbable. In France resistance to the march of the people was stubborn. With notable exceptions the privileged classes and the king stood against the people like a rock in the midst of a swelling stream. They went so far that they even forgot and disregarded the sentiment of patriotism, the strongest passion of a Frenchman, and called in foreign foes to fight against the people. That drove the struggling sansculottes to desperation ; they were about to be overwhelmed by foes within and foes without, and they became willing to be led by Robespierre and the other fanatics who proposed extreme measures, and thus the Terror was born. Had Louis had the wisdom and courage to side with his people when the States General met or even after the great festival in the Champ de Mars, his life and the blood of the nation would have been spared. The Terror is no legitimate part of the French Revolution ; it belongs to the counter-revolution. The same change to democracy took place in England without violence because the privileged classes gradually and steadily gave way and the people came to rely upon their giving way.

In this country there are two things that make a violent crisis most improbable. The people are now possessed of the fruits of the Revolution and of the succeeding years. Some of those fruits are political liberty, the triumph of democracy, the multiplication of wealth, the universal extension of education, and practical experience in co-operation ; but more important than all these things is the disintegrating influence of the spirit of altruism, which is undermining the power-holding classes. A few of the most generous minds are already won over by their sense of justice, and those who remain are unable to escape the same subtle compelling influence. The holders of special privileges no longer believe strongly in their own cause, they lack the aggressive power of a great conviction, and are unable to use their great strength. They no longer openly defend the old order even, but tacitly admit that it has outlived its usefulness. They are driven to argue that there is exaggeration, that things are not quite so bad as represented, and, as a last resource, they can only argue that the remedy proposed is not effectual and that the evil is probably irremediable. The only objections urged to Socialistic reforms are the practical

difficulties involved. As a question of abstract justice they are unassailable. The victories of the people are not won in the streets but in the hearts of the higher classes. This was true to a large extent even in France. Some of the nobility openly sided with the people and the spirit of altruism sapped the strength of all the privileged classes, but particularly do we see the cause of the submerged majority sustained by the middle class. Not a single man of the laboring class rose to leadership in the Revolution, and the long list of beneficent measures in the interest of the masses, passed by the Jacobin Convention in the midst of a life and death struggle, was the work of the bourgeoisie.

What, then, is the lesson of the French Revolution? The Socialist, or representative of the masses, by whatever name called, may learn the folly of sudden change. He may perceive that destruction requires but a night, but that constructive work requires time; that if one vast system of social organization is to be supplanted by another, the change must be by the slow processes of nature, the gradual accumulation of changes, and that the answer to sudden and violent destruction is the mighty name Napoleon. The Revolution was in reality a glorious success, but at what cost and with what reactions and delays, the evil influences of which are felt to this day. "No greater calamity can befall a nation than for her to cut herself off from all vital connection with her own past."

He may learn that the hope, entertained by some, that when things get sufficiently bad the people will right them is deceptive, revolutions being brought about on a rising current of positive activities; and that his scorn of half-way measures and partial reforms is most irrational. These should be welcomed as representing principles implanted that will ultimately grow into mighty forces. They are the steady yielding of the property-holding classes before the steady advance of the people. It has been the misfortune of the French that they have insisted on logical completeness and have counted nothing gained until the last term of the syllogism was realized, and it has been the good fortune of the Anglo-Saxon to seize the opportunity, implant the seed and leave its development to the future.

He may learn further that his cause will not be won by a death struggle between classes, but by a softening and deepening of character in those who belong naturally to the other side, and who will turn to help their fellows; that the struggle is not between the Haves and Have-nots, but between the selfish Haves on the one side and the Have-nots and unselfish Haves on the other.

The rich and favored may learn the utter futility of resistance and that wisdom and honor lie in yielding, not because retreat is inevitable but because the progress of mankind points that way.

Every consideration enjoins the duty and wisdom of finding out the course of evolution and getting in line with it. If there is any conclusion to be drawn from the pages of history we may be sure of this, that through the ages the children of men have been slowly and painfully but steadily realizing their freedom, and that the future belongs to the people. It is necessary to disabuse our minds of the prevalent notion that the doctrines of Socialism are the heated imaginings of unbalanced minds. They represent a moral force of the most profound significance, and whatever individual errors may be found among them, they are the sober teachings of earnest and scholarly men. The Socialist movement is the most characteristic movement of our time and nothing is more remarkable than the uncertainty, bewilderment and hesitation with which it is regarded.

It matters not that many and conflicting schemes for another order of society are proposed, that with one reformer a flaw may be found in his theory of economics, that with another his moral code may be justly liable to criticism or his theology open to attack. It matters not that with every one the imagination has failed to picture all the difficulties and human ingenuity has failed to surmount them all. These things merely prove the wisdom of the divine method of slow and painfully won evolution rather than off-hand construction. These things belong to the future.

The great thing and the thing that belongs to the present is to realize that "the commonwealth of mankind is a holy object and that to labor for its welfare is the only true and worthy life;" not for the welfare of the good and industrious, nor the welfare of our class, of our church, or our nation, but for the welfare of all men. We are not called on to outline a social order and prove that it will work; we are called on to desire earnestly that all men may be lifted into the rivalry of existence, and have an equal chance at life with all other men and to do what lies within us to that end.

Happy the man who, having genius and power, feels his kinship with his fellows and devotes himself to the cause of the people. Such men are the truly great. Verily he who would be greatest among you, let him be the servant of all.

Clarence Arthur Royse.

The Belgian Municipal Committee.

THE municipal program was adopted in the first years of our party by a national congress of all organizations. But until 1895 we had a very little municipal activity. After the elections of 1895 we had about 800 municipal councillors elected as Socialists, out of which 550 to 600 remained real Socialists. At the elections of 1899 this last number became 650, with some 150 elected as Socialists. Among the councillors the great majority were workmen who had no idea of what is the law or what are municipal affairs. The obligation to do better than the old parties, to survey all things, to suppress the abuses, needs as exact knowledge of the law as of the rules. There was a great danger in doing wrong steps.

All these elements created the necessity of having a Federation, and especially of having a permanent secretary who could give to our members all the necessary legal advice.

At that moment it was said that the secretary would have as annual resources 4,000 francs, out of which 2,000 francs was for himself. Each member should pay one franc annually and the rest should be obtained by subsidies of organizations. That remained mere theory. About 550 members paid one franc and the subsidies varied annually from 500 to 600 francs. Since 1899 the Federation had a monthly paper called "Bulletin Communal," and published as a part of the Review of the party "Avenir Social." The "Bulletin Communal" contains sixteen pages. From that time the members have to pay three francs annually. From the first of January, 1903, the "Bulletin Communal" will be printed separate from "L'Avenir Social," although it will be given to the subscribers of the "Avenir Social," as a part of it.

Thus the members of the Federation will for three francs have the right to ask for legal advice and information about municipal affairs, and receive the "Bulletin Communal." The number of advices given is about 400 a year, and they are given by letter.

Each year the Federation has a national congress in Brussels, where some points of municipal politics are discussed. The national congress of the whole party held last year has decided that the affiliation of Socialist councillors would be compulsory, and that the organization would be responsible for their councillors and for the payment of membership. That decision was practically necessary because at the end of 1903 we have our municipal elections, and because the party is no more willing to have 150 to 200 men elected as Socialists who are not Socialists. I dare say that this year the elections will be well controlled.

We will try also to develop our Bulletin by having correspondents in the different part of Belgium to give us information about the municipal activity.

From 1899 to 1903 the committee was composed of five members, all of Brussels and suburbs. Practically the secretary only had something to do.

The last congress (November, 1902) elected a national committee of 200 members taken in the various parts of the country. The first meeting of this council will be held in the month of January. The council will have now to stimulate more and more the activity of our councillors, and that is very often necessary.

Emile Vinck.

The Forges of the Nations.

IN the forges of the nations how the furnaces still glow !
Are they beating into ploughshares all their swords of
battle? No!
They are welding stronger fetters for the bleeding feet of
Man

Who has trampled out their vintage till the purple juices ran.

Cling! Clang! Cling! do you hear the anvils ringing?

Cling! Clang! Cling! is there music in their singing,

When the sparks that upward fly

Are the souls of men who die

For the cause they make heroic and the land they glorify?

They have sealed Man's eyes with darkness. Have they blinded
him for good?

They have mocked him as they crowned him with the crown of
Brotherhood.

They have rent his garments from him, they have spat upon his
face;

Given him a reed for scepter till the cross was in its place.

Tramp! Tramp! Tramp! do you hear the armies coming?

St—St—St—do you hear the bullets humming?

Blood of man must quench the thirst

Of the lips of Death the first

Ere it trickles to the rulers where they sit enthroned, accursed!

See the bloodhounds of the ocean, how they follow on the trail

Till the seas of sunset redden and the stars of midnight fail!

On the prow the spectral helmsman turns the wheel from left to
right;

Twenty thousand years of carnage have not sated his delight.

Ugh! Ugh! Ugh! do you hear the engines throbbing?

Hush! Hush! Hush! do you hear the billows sobbing?

What is fitter for the brave

Than a couch beneath the wave

When they give their lives in battle for a land they cannot save?

O the day is coming, coming! Man shall reap what he has sown.

Then no Power on earth shall bind him, nor yet turn his bread to
stone!

But a little, O my Brothers, but a little must ye wait;
Even now I hear a whisper and a knocking at the gate!

Rise! Rise! Rise! O ye men who live to labor.
Up! Up! Up! go and sing it to your neighbor.
Though you're bloodied by the goad,
Though you're burdened with a load,
O prepare, prepare to follow! God Himself is on the road!
Lorenzo Sosso.

The Proletaire and the Trusts.

THE Trusts, omnipotent on Trade's proud Mart,
Stood chains in hand, and Bourgeoisie, heart dead,
Brain dark, bowed servile, low, and thralldom swore.
But Proletaire stood head tense, high; struck chains
To ground; bold flung fierce, far their battle line—
Until the haughty Tyrants quaked. And then
Advancing fast past boycott, picket, strike,
They sent their Statesmen bold to Hall of State;
And there on Freeman's glorious Battle Ground
They smote their fell usurped power death blow;
They made them wondrous Servants of Mankind.
Frederick Irons Bamford.

Oakland, Calif., January 29, '03.

The Social Effects of the Eight-Hour Day.

THE above is the title of an address delivered by Prof. McVey, of the University of Minnesota, at the Employers and Employes' Conference, held in Minneapolis in September, 1902. The address was afterwards published in the January number of the American Journal of Sociology.

The address was, in my opinion, the ablest delivered at that conference. Professor McVey is an ardent student, a thinker of more than average ability, and well versed in the theory of political science as taught at present *ex cathedra*.

In summing up the economic effects of the eight-hour day, Professor McVey arrives at the same conclusions as the Socialists do. He concludes his address thus: "The economic value of this change is yet to be appreciated, but there can be no doubt of its great productive power when applied to industry. Under its influence the old rate of daily production will be maintained, with little or no effect in the long run upon wages, profits, the unemployed, and foreign commerce." In other words, it will not solve the question of "the industrial reserve army" and will materially affect neither wages nor profits. The address is interesting to the Socialist from the point of view of its fallacious economic teachings.

The economics propounded by Professor McVey is what I propose to criticize and bring out the difference between the Marxian School of Political Economy and the "School of Vulgar Economy," as Marx called it. I do not mean by it that any adherent of that school is a vulgar person, but that the economic teachings of that school are vulgar and not scientific. The economics which are correctly stated by the professor are Marxian and what is not Marxian there is false.

Now to the body of the address.

"The introduction of machinery," we read in the address, "at the close of the last century, with the attendant *high cost of capital*,* forced longer hours of labor than existed under the old domestic system." The expression "high cost of capital" is rather vague and I construe it to mean either that the hours of labor were prolonged because the rate of interest on capital invested was high, or he may, possibly, mean by it that a larger outlay of constant capital (means of production, raw material, auxiliaries, etc.), is required per individual laborer under production of machinery, consequently more must go as interest to capital from

*The italics are mine.

each laborer than under the domestic system. If the professor meant the former, then the question arises, why were the hours of labor shorter, in England at least, during the last three centuries preceding the latter part of the 18th century, as shown by Thorold Rogers when interest on money was very high? If by "high cost of capital" he means the second category, why then, may we ask, are the hours of labor shorter now in spite of the constant increase of the quantity of constant capital required to employ a given quantity of laborers, in consequence of the constant progress in the technique of production? The Marxian explanation is much simpler, and yet withstands better the criticisms, namely: Simultaneously and preceding the introduction of the factory system the great mass of the population in England, the mother country of industrial capital, was driven off the land and thus deprived of the means of self employment. Being helpless and disorganized, with no political power, with the state and the courts against them, and with draconian measures on the statute books since the reign of Henry VIII., against any combination of labor, capital set as the work day's limit—the laborer's physical endurance.

Coming to the source of wages the professor comes to the right conclusion that it is "thus ultimately paid out of the product," but his economic theory which leads up to that conclusion is to a Marxist, to say the least, amusing. "Undoubtedly," says McVey, "the rate of wages does depend upon the demand for labor, but in turn the demand for labor rests upon the aggregate capital of the community, which is determined by the gross product and the demand for commodities, while the gross production is governed by the productivity of labor." Now the "rate of wages" does not depend "upon the demand for labor," for the rate, it is the proportion of the product that goes to labor is constantly diminishing; we may say that in general the greater the productivity the smaller the rate of wages, while the price of the money sum of wages irrespective of its ratio to the total value of the product does depend to some extent on the demand, but not entirely, for the price of labor power like that of any other commodity, is subject to the same laws governing prices of commodities in general, namely, the price of production or the natural price of Ricardo, which is, supply and demand being equal or eliminated, the expense or cost of production plus the general average rate of profit; in other words, the price of labor power is, generally speaking, the cost of its maintenance. The aggregate capital may be very large, but when there are no profits in view, no "demands for commodities, the gross production will be small, irrespective of the great mass of labor power looking for employment and irrespective of the productivity and intensity of labor.

Professor McVey says—* * * “in no sense does increase of wages rest solely upon the cost of subsistence. Increase of wages, as well as reduction of hours, is limited by the producing power of labor.” If by “increase of wages” he means an increased amount, an increased ratio of the constantly increasing product, he is greatly in error. The statistics of the last and former census prove that the ratio of wages to the total value of the product is constantly diminishing; but if he only meant increase in dollars and cents, then he is only *partially* correct, for it depends more upon the economic organization of the workers—the pure and simple trade-union—than upon “the producing power of labor.” The eight-hour day in coal mines in England and the higher wages paid to bituminous coal miners in the United States, sufficiently substantiates my contention.

“The phenomenon of non-employment,” says Professor McVey, “is due in a large measure to sickness, shiftlessness of individual laborers, and the fluctuations of commercial credit, resulting in the closing of mills and the discharge of workers.” But, pray, why not tell us of the main economic cause which in the last instance is mostly responsible for “the fluctuations of commercial credit,” namely, over-production, or, as some call it, under-consumption, which is the result of production for profits; in other words, is the natural sequence of the wage system.

Professor McVey is of the opinion that the eight-hour day will not solve the problem of the unemployed and is on this point in accord with the Marxists. “In Victoria,” he tells us, “the unemployed are still evident in great numbers. The organization of the ‘New Unionism’ in this Australian State is proof of the inability of the eight-hour day to absorb those out of work. * * *

It may be boldly stated that no provision such as the one under discussion is able to solve the difficulties which have their root in the whole economic basis of industry.”

As the professor bases wages upon the productivity of labor only, which I have already criticized above, he, very properly, puts the question, ‘how far an eight-hour day is likely to impair production and in consequence diminish the quantity of wealth produced.’ You will observe here that McVey as an economist is simply interested that the total output of products be not diminished; he does not concern himself here with the problem of “distribution” of the wealth produced. He comes to the conclusion as reached by Marx that by reducing the hours of labor you can increase the intensity of labor power. To use Marxian terms, the rule may be thus stated. Within certain bounds, what the capitalist may lose in absolute surplus value by shortening the labor-day, he gains in relative surplus value by increased intensity of the

labor-process. Of course this leaves exploitation of labor as it was before, but as already stated the author discusses the subject from the standpoint of a scientist, not that of a labor agitator.

Speaking of the results of an eight-hour day, McVey arrives at the conclusion that, "Nevertheless, the eight-hour day must cost somebody something in loss of profit, greater exertion in a shorter period of time, or smaller wages, * * * the loss will fall upon interest, since the wages of superintendence and insurance against risk cannot be affected."

Professor McVey is an adherent of the modern school of political economy, which teaches that there are no profits, that the capitalist only receives interest on the capital invested, and "wages of superintendence," plus insurance against risk, but by all means no profits. His natural sagacity tells him that the practical world around him still clings to the old, antiquated and unscientific (?) term "profits." It is on account of this difficulty that the professor sometimes mentions "profits" and omits the term at other times in this same address.

Marx teaches in Vol. III. of Capital that actual wages of superintendence, i. e., adequate pay for actual and required superintendence, as well as insurance against risk and depreciation of capital must be counted in the expense of circulation of capital, the balance is gross profits from which interest is deducted. We do this in practice in all enterprises, except in gigantic corporations which inflate their stock to absorb part of profits as interest and overburden some dignitaries with from \$25,000 to \$1,000,000 a year as "wages of superintendence," when the actual work is done by a subordinate whose salary seldom exceeds 20 per cent of that of the nominal "president" or "head man." The rate of interest is sometimes high when profits are small, such as during a financial panic, but in general the rate of interest is more stable than the rate of profit.

Professor McVey sees danger in trade-unions cutting down the average rate of work, in other words, limiting the excessive intensity of the labor process, for this will produce a smaller output and in the end less wages. This, professor, may be so, and may not be so, it will depend on the relative strength of the capitalist class upon the one side and of the proletariat upon the other, though it must be admitted that should that happen nowadays, the economic organization of the workers is unable in itself to withstand an onslaught on wages and their standard of living would necessarily become lowered. Professor McVey throws out a gentle hint to the capitalist class that is well worth reproducing here. "The eight-hour day," says he, "is a reasonable request, that from the point of view of selfish interest, employers would do

well to grant it. Give labor a generation or more in the organization of the workers, and great changes will be wrought that will produce marked results in the ownership, direction and management of industry. Reasonable requests granted now will make the transition less difficult and severe."

I have discussed the address here mainly for two reasons. First, to show the fallacious reasoning on economic subjects by able bourgeois economists. Second, to prove to non-Socialists that a fair and unbiased bourgeois economist must concede that there are "difficulties which have their root in the whole economic basis of industry," and that in the long run the eight-hour day, if adopted, will have hardly any effect upon wages, profits, the unemployed and foreign commerce.

A. Hirschfield, M. D.

Minneapolis, Minn.

To Socialism.

REVILED defender and upholder of the rights of Man;
Unfaltering asserter of the Brotherhood of Man;
Unflinching facer of those future years so filled with
frowns of free-born men no longer free who
love thee not—

Endue me with thy poise.

Provider of perpetual peace that stills pale, haggard Competi-
tion's call to war;

Sole selfless Savior of the race from all-enslaving Greed;
Unconscious Christian crying Christ's commands aloud, still nailed
upon the cross as He—

Endue me with thy peace.

Impartial pupil of imperial Right that places plenty in the hands
of each;

Stern slayer of the sullen soul will not surrender stolen, selfish
joys;

All-patient lover of the poor, still paid with penal name by portion-
less participants of pauper's lot and fare—

Grant me to love as thou.

Forecaster of a future filled with faithful work performed with
joy by all;

Denouncer of these dotage-days that doom and damn both rich
and poor;

Courageous, calm, Compatriot calling "Come" to rich and poor
alike—

Grant me to echo "Come."

Aspiring, some would strike all chains from willing and unwilling
slaves.

Aspiring to thy poise, thy peace, thy love unbounded free and all
despite of hate, they call—to even echo it—one heard
thee say,

"Let be!

I am the solvent sets all free:

Bring them to me."

Aspiring sends this song from one whose bondage was dissolved
by thy embrace, in gratitude this day.

O Thou incessant and unstinting Sower of the lift-bought seed
with wide-flung hand in ev'ry clime,

God speed, God speed—and SPEED!

Edwin Arnold Brenholtz.

NEW AND STANDARD

Books on Socialism

Handsomely Bound in Cloth ... Fifty Cents Each

God's Children.—By JAMES ALLMAN. A Modern Allegory. One of the greatest satires on capitalist society ever written.

Britain for the British (America for the Americans.)—By ROBERT BLATCHFORD, author of "Merrie England." 200,000 already sold.

The Communist Manifesto.—By KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS. Ours is the handsomest edition ever printed of this classic of Socialism.

The Principles of Social Progress: A Study of Civilization.—By JAMES BALE MORMAN, A. B. Extra cloth, 240 large pages.

Letters from New America, or An Attempt at Practical Socialism. By CLARK EDMUND PERSINGER.

STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES

1. **Karl Marx.** Biographical Memoirs.—By WILHELM LIEBKNECHT. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. **Collectivism and Industrial Evolution.**—By EMILE VANDERVELDE. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. **The American Farmer.**—By A. M. SIMONS.
4. **The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.**—By ISAAC BROOME.
5. **The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. **The Social Revolution.**—By KARL KAUTSKY. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. **Socialism Utopian and Scientific.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
8. **Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Austin Lewis.

The *International Socialist Review*, edited by A. M. Simons, is the one indispensable periodical for whoever wishes to understand socialism. Monthly, 64 pages, 10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a year. We will send the *Review* one year to a new name, and will mail any two of the books described above for one dollar, if this advertisement is mentioned.

Charles H. Kerr & Company. (Co-operative), 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago

Ruskin University.

A combination of eleven hitherto independent colleges offers instruction in technical, literary, and scientific branches. Located at Glen Ellyn, Ill., 33 minutes' ride from Chicago; 2,500 resident students, 8,000 correspondence students, and 250 teachers.

CORRESPONDENCE DEPARTMENT IN SOCIOLOGY.

The work in this department is modeled on the correspondence work of the best universities and the standard of scholarship will be maintained as high as that in any educational institution in the country. The following courses are now ready, and others are in preparation.

1. AMERICAN ECONOMIC HISTORY—By A. M. Simons.

Economic Conditions Leading to the Discovery of America; Colonial Economic Development; Economic Causes of the Revolution; Class Struggle on the Adoption of the Constitution; the Frontier Movement; Struggle Between Northern Capitalists and Southern Chattel Slave Owners; Growth of Capitalism, Trusts and a Class Conscious Working Class.

POLITICAL ECONOMY—By May Wood Simons.

The Wealth Concept; Stages of Economic Development; Factors in Production; Theories of Rent, Wages, Interest and Profit. The Classical and Modern Writers on Political Economy are studied historically, comparatively and critically and the evolution of Economic ideas are traced through their various stages up to the present time.

SOCIALISM—By May Wood Simons.

A careful comparative study of the Utopians and other forerunners of modern scientific Socialism, followed by an exposition of Marxian economics, the Economic Interpretation of History, the Class Struggle and the development of Capitalism preparatory to Socialism. There is a series of Lectures on the relation of Socialism to the State, Education, Organized Labor, Science, Ethics and Art, closing with an historical survey of the modern Socialist Movement.

Regular lessons have been prepared in these courses, but these will be varied with special lessons and additional references on any desired phase of the subjects treated. Each student will be treated individually and the work especially adapted to his needs and capabilities. The minimum number of lessons in each course is twenty and the fee for each course is ten dollars. Each correspondence course is credited as equal to three months resident work at the university.

Resident Courses, preparatory, collegiate and industrial, may be pursued at Glen Ellyn at a total cost of \$150 per year, \$100 of which it is possible for the student to earn in the industrial department while pursuing his studies and without increasing the length of time necessary for a course.

For further information address

HEADQUARTERS RUSKIN UNIVERSITY, 103-109 Randolph St., Chicago.

EDITORIAL

The United Mine Workers' Victory.

At last the long delay and deliberation are over and the arbitration committee has brought forth its report, and the capitalist press unanimously hail it as a victory for the miners.

The main point on which this cry for victory is based is in the 10 per cent rise, in the reduction to eight hours for a few favored laborers, the right to have check weighmen and a few similar articles. That this is a gain no one will deny, that it is in many senses of the word a victory is also true, but the further conclusion which practically every one of these papers draw, that the victory was attained through the methods of arbitration, we are unable to see.

Some months ago when the arbitration committee was first elected we pointed out that the miners would receive just what the proletariat has always received in a contest with its masters,—what it was able to take. There is, at least, some doubt if in this case the United Miners have not received even less than they could have taken had the fight gone on. We now know that there was nearly a million dollars still remaining in their treasury with funds pouring in from all over the world. We now know that a few weeks more of the strike would have brought on a coal famine that would have paralyzed the industries of this country. The great capitalists probably knew this at the time the arbitration committee was appointed. They must have known something of the probable effect of such a coal famine on the permanency of exploiting institutions. It is pretty safe to say that in view of this knowledge they would have been willing to have conceded the full demands originally made by the strikers rather than to have permitted the strike to have gone on to much greater length.

Every day that passed during the closing weeks of the struggle gathered new converts for the miners' cause. At the same time the Socialists were using the material which was developing from day to day with tremendous force as an indictment against the entire system of capitalism. Under these conditions it is at least questionable whether Mitchell showed good tactics, considered from a trade union point of view, in accepting a Committee of Arbitration whose membership was so decidedly capitalistic. While considering what they have granted to the miners, the question comes up, could they have given much less and had any surety that another strike would

not at once follow? It seems hard to believe that men living in the conditions that it has been shown the miners of Pennsylvania were living, and who had just been able to show such marvelous solidarity and organized resistance, would have remained quiet had they received much of anything less than what the Commission awarded them.

On the other hand, it must be at once admitted that the investigation of the Commission has not been without its value. Its proceedings when published will throw a flood of light upon industrial conditions in one of the greatest of American industries. This information will be of the greatest value in every battle which is waged against exploitation.

It is certain that the Pennsylvania Socialists who have shown such remarkable growth during and since the strike will derive new ammunition from this report for future battles. But neither of these things offers any argument in support of the arbitration of industrial disputes.

Just how sincere the capitalist press have been in declaring the decision to be a great victory for the strikers is seen by an extract from a private telegram which has come into our hands, which was sent out by a well known firm of Wall street brokers to their customers. After giving the terms of the Commission report they say of the demands: "All of these, particularly five, six, eight and nine, are absolutely in favor of operators. The first and second clauses were offered by Mr. Baer three months ago. This looks like favorable news for PENNSYLVANIA, ERIE FIRST and D. & H."

The "five, six, eight and nine," which they favor, are the clauses concerning check weighmen, directing the payment by operators directly to mine laborers, condemnation of boycott and of blacklist. So much for the present. When we come to consider the future we are confronted with the proposition stated above that the contending parties will get exactly what they are able to take. There is no power outside of either of the parties to enforce the decisions of the Commission. In so far as governmental power will be called into use it is upon the side of the operators. There will undoubtedly be another fight before this recognition is granted.

The most encouraging feature of the whole matter lies in the fact that the recent election returns from Pennsylvania have shown that a very large number of miners are aware of the importance of having governmental power on their side, and are uniting with the Socialist Party to that end. If Mitchell stands in the road to this movement as the public press credits him with doing, he will simply be crushed beneath it. The prestige which he has gained from the booming of the capitalist press will soon pass away and he will find himself dependent upon the only force from which he ever had a right to expect support, that of the workers.

In the mean time E. E. Clark has been rewarded for his work on the Commission by receiving a fat governmental appointment in the new Department of Commerce. Query: If he has assisted in the gaining of so great a victory for the mine workers and consequent de-

feat for the operators, why does a government controlled by the class to which the operators belong, see fit to reward him?

Owing to the pressure of work entailed by his position on the Appeal to Reason, Comrade Untermyann has been compelled to sever his connection with the International Socialist Review. Those who have followed his work on the foreign department will be aware that this means a significant loss. He has built up this department until it has constituted a complete current history of the international Socialist movement. We shall endeavor in the future to as far as possible maintain this high standard, and will as before supplement it with original articles by our foreign correspondents and translations of articles from the leading foreign publications bearing upon special topics.

.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

That the trade union movement will be compelled to face a new issue in the near future is an absolute certainty. Some of the present conservative leaders have been flattering themselves that the capitalistic brethren would meet them on neutral ground and discuss and arbitrate the "irrepressible conflict," but, despite the fact that the National Civic Federation was formed by a few shrewd politicians and pulpiteers for the purpose of "harmonizing" the contending elements, the class struggle is waging more fiercely than ever. We have seen with what contempt Morgan treated the iron and steel workers when the latter were compelled to battle for their lives a year and a half ago, and how the anthracite barons disdained to meet with the mine workers last fall. Now comes a crisis in the railway world—the trainmen are enjoined by the courts from striking on the Wabash Railway and scabs and Pinkertons by the thousands are held in readiness at this writing to aid Bro. Capital in worsting Bro. Labor. From New York comes the report that the National Structural Iron Manufacturers' Association, representing firms in all the leading cities with a total capital of a billion dollars, has been organized for the purpose of smashing the unions that contemplate making demands for increased wages, and it is thought that by the first of May 300,000 men will be involved in a national strike if they persist in demanding better conditions. Already over three thousand men are out in Pittsburg, Philadelphia, New York, Marietta and Youngstown, Ohio. The bridge and structural iron manufacturers are organizing their scabs for the purpose of undermining the unions, and the storm center of the struggle is now at Pittsburg. Then the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Metal Trades' Association, and various other national organizations of employers are pushing the work of combining their strength to resist the aggressions of trade unions. In Ohio, Indiana and Illinois especially the capitalists are active and combative. From Dayton, O., the Kirby crowd is organizing the employers in scores of cities; from Indianapolis, Ind., the Parry machinery is spreading out, and from Chicago, Mr. Frederic W. Job is ramifying the State of Illinois, as well as neighboring States, with local associations of employers. The latter gentleman boasts of having organized the capitalists in 24 cities during the last few months and expects to double the number before the end of the year. We have already seen that Parry claims that his organization has grown from two hundred to as many thousand members in the last year, and he is directing a myriad of subalterns in the work of

combining his fellow-capitalists. The "busy bees" of Dayton are also operating in a manner that is indicative of growing power among the would-be union masters of the Buckeye State. The National Metal Trades' Association is swamping the metal manufacturers with literature on the necessity of getting together to resist the "unreasonable demands" of the unions, and it is re-enforced by the National Economic League, which is particularly disturbed by the "Socialistic sentiment" among the unions. Furthermore in the extreme East, in the South and the West combinations of capitalists are forming everywhere under various names for the purpose of keeping the laboring people in their places and oppressing them a little more if possible. It will probably not take long until these various organizations are federated in the manner suggested by Mr. Herman Justl, of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, and Hanna's Civic Federation, and who is being regarded in certain circles just now as "labor's friend." When that plan has been arranged it is practically certain that organized labor will not be welcomed with open arms to make demands for higher wages and shorter working time and other improved conditions. On the contrary, labor will receive scant courtesy, and if labor goes on strike the army of professional scabs that will be kept in reserve can be thrown into the breach, protected by the new kind of militia paraphernalia that is being passed out by the war department and the injunctions of the courts. Probably it makes certain so-called labor leaders feel good for the time being when they deny the existence of a class struggle—perhaps because Hanna and Grover Cleveland and Archbishop Ireland and Sissy Easley and the rest of the Civicers utter honeyed words and bill and coo like a suckling dove—but, in the words of a great statesman, "facts is facts," and whether the clash between the workers and the capitalists for the wealth the former produce is perceptible to near-sighted people or not it is here and will have to be met. Organization on the part of workers in unions is a correct principle, but since the capitalists control the national, State and municipal governments it is necessary that the workers likewise organize themselves into the Socialist party, and, being as ten to one, wrest those governmental powers from capital at the ballot-box when they will gain the freedom and equality for which their class has been struggling for centuries.

* * *

The Window Glass Workers' Union, probably the most powerful labor organization in the world, has been delivered a mortal blow. The American Window Glass Co., the trust, has introduced machinery and all of its thousands of workers have been told that their services were no longer required and its plants have been closed to be refitted with machines. An expert who has witnessed the operation of the machines in the trust plant at Alexandria, Ind., says that eight machines equal the output of 54 blowers and 54 gatherers. The machines blow glass in any length and thickness desired, one ordinary laborer runs two machines, the product is superior to the hand-blown article, the output is greater and the cost about one-fifth of the old method. The revolution is complete. The skilled workers have lost their jobs forever; the trust owns the machines, and it is doubtful whether

prices of window glass will be lowered much, except perhaps for a short time to run the small plants off the earth. This is another cold fact and not a theory that confronts the workers. Mark you, the capitalists, who own the machines, will prosper while labor suffers and starves. Under Socialism the window glass workers would have their labor time reduced and would operate the machines, while their recompense would be materially increased. But labor votes to give capital the machinery and the land and the wealth produced, and gets what it votes for.

* * *

Henry Clews, J. J. Hill, Yerkes and other multi-millionaires, are busy denouncing the "greed" of the labor unions. They are declaring in interviews and circulars that the laboring people are making such unreasonable demands that capitalists are discouraged from investing for fear of making no profits, and also that production is costing so much that foreign markets are slipping away from U. S.—"us." The great capitalists contend that the country has reached the apex of prosperity and is now gradually dropping back into a period of industrial stagnation. Reports from Wall street seem to confirm these calamity howls. The markets are said to be sluggish and that there is only professional trading, while the great capitalists are unloading their doubtful securities and evidently preparing for a storm. In three years upward of five billions worth (or worthless) stocks and bonds have been floated on the street, and fully ten per cent of that amount cannot be placed. The powers that be will probably squeeze the sponge and let some of the water that the middle class capitalists own run out—they call it "liquidation." Then the big fellows can step in, after much of the water has been drained from the street, and catch the suckers at their ease and their price, and once more inflate their holdings. It's a great game and would be amusing if it were not that the workers are compelled to sit around and hunger and suffer until the captains of industry see fit to start the wheels going again. The cause for the decline is, of course, not that labor secures too much of what it produces, but not enough. The unconsumed surplus increases and is reflected in the trading among the money-changers and brokers and gamblers. The element of profit in the possession of the Clewses and Hills and Morgans and Rockefellers is the source of all the trouble. If the workers secured the full product of their toil they could exchange freely and on a basis of equality, and there would be no such periodical crises as the people now experience in the capitalist system of production, which is upheld and defended by the Republican and Democratic parties.

* * *

Two more important conferences have been held during the past month to define the jurisdiction question between national unions. Representatives of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters met in New York and were in session about ten days, but no settlement was arranged, although a better understanding was had than existed previously, which may result in closer affiliation later on. The brotherhood has about 150,000 mem-

bers at present, while the Society numbers but 3,000 in this country. The Society, however, is truly international, having branches in all the English-speaking countries on the globe, and a total membership approaching a hundred thousand. This Society has a million dollars in its strong box, and the funds are constantly equalized among the 850 branches in all parts of the world, so that if, for example, a strike broke out in Chicago the workers could be kept out indefinitely, while other beneficial features also serve to make the organization one of the strongest and most progressive in the world. The Brotherhood and the Amalgamated Woodworkers' Union also had a conference in Indianapolis, and the commission chosen to arbitrate their differences decided that the carpenters should control all outside labor and the woodworkers those who were employed in the mills. There is considerable criticism aimed at the Brotherhood in union circles. The feeling is that the latter organization has grown so rapidly that its officials have become flushed with success and are trying to overawe and absorb the other two organizations instead of using conciliatory measures and arranging a close federation that would result in final amalgamation. The outlook is that the "autonomy" question will be as much in evidence in the next convention of the A. F. of L. as it has been during the last three or four gatherings.

* * *

Labor has been organizing so rapidly in the South that the Bourbons are attempting to outlaw the strike. A bill has passed the South Carolina Senate which prohibits cotton and woolen factories and their operatives from engaging in sympathetic strikes and lockouts. The penalty is a fine of \$100 a day. So far as lockouts are concerned, the bosses can easily close a mill and say that business is bad or that to grant higher wages or reduction of hours will bankrupt them. The bill is aimed at labor and nobody else, and those Southern politicians are hypocrites, like the Northern brethren.

* * *

Well, the fact must be recorded that Congress has adjourned and the labor bills introduced at the beginning of the session are suspended between heaven and earth—they are up in the air! The politicians played pingpong with the labor bills. The eight-hour bill, the anti-injunction bill, the safety appliance bill and the prison labor bill were rushed through one branch of Congress and into a pigeon-hole in the other branch, as per agreement between the Senators and Representatives. The bill to create a department of labor and commerce was emasculated by striking out "labor" and then in a large measure destroyed the independence and usefulness of the Bureau of Labor by making it a step-child to be kicked into a corner of the Department of Commerce, which is and henceforth will be presided over by a rank partisan appointed by the President. This new department is also supposed to have supervision over the trusts, as well as labor, but nobody expects that Mr. Cortelyou will inaugurate any revolutionary or reactionary policy. Once certain labor leaders, so-called, had a dream that some day a real live labor man would have the opportunity of being in the Presidential household and stretching

his legs under the White House table, instead of playing waiter and butler and—voter. But the pipe went out. A “safe” man will inform us about labor and capital all that is considered well to know. The generation that was in babyhood when organized labor began to lobby for legislation has reached the seer and yellow leaf, but the labor bills are still sleeping soundly in pigeon-holes. It is bruited about that one of our great leaders, in an unguarded moment acknowledged that his trousers have been worn out at the knee owing to his long vigils and prayerful pleadings for the passage of labor bills. Some rāntankerous Socialists may denounce the good old custom of begging for legislative crumbs and utter the wild and unpatriotic advice to “turn the rascals out” and elect labor men who understand their class interests. But they are extremists and “rainbow-chasers.” What we need is object lessons, and the more the merrier. Hence the game will go on during the next Congress and the next. Amen—world without end.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Holland.

We have elsewhere in this number an article giving the particulars of the great struggle which is going on in Holland at this moment. At the time this was written the great question was what would the government do? The government has just answered this question by the introduction of a proposed law of which the following is an outline:

The first Act deals with strikes in general, and proposes that any single person, who, by a strike, even peacefully or otherwise, persuades another to stop work, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of three months, or a maximum fine of 100 guilders; and when the same thing is done by two or more persons in common, the punishment will be doubled. The judge has the power to disfranchise persons thus convicted.

The second part of the same Act is concerned with strikes on public services, such as railways, post and telegraphy, and so on. And it proposes to make such strikes altogether illegal. Any single person thus employed and striking work shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of six months, or a fine of 300 guilders. A strike of two or more persons so employed will be treated as conspiracy, and punished with a maximum imprisonment of four years, without the alternative of a fine. The maximum punishment will be raised to six years' imprisonment if the public service is stopped in consequence of the strike. The leaders as well as the originators of the latter will equally be punished, while anyone who by speech or writing advises such employes to go on strike is to be held guilty of instigation, and is liable to a maximum of five years' imprisonment, or a fine of 300 guilders.

The second Act is to enable the government to form among the soldiers a reserve brigade to serve on railways in case the ordinary railway men stop work. The third Act appoints a committee to inquire into the work and conditions of the railway servants.

Against this proposed law the entire force of the social democracy in Holland is being used. Tremendous protest meetings are held everywhere. In the Chamber itself the government desired to discuss this subject in secret session, but the Socialists with the help of the liberals and radicals succeeded in compelling them to discuss it publicly. A committee of defense has been organized which

in the first week of the strike had circulated 200,000 manifestoes throughout the country. It roused a large number of local organizations to hold meetings of protest and is gathering large sums of money to carry on the fight in the future.

One of the first effects of this attack by the capitalist class was to drive together the hitherto disintegrated Socialist movement of Holland, touching which a correspondent of *Vorwaerts* says: "What has not been possible for many years and was scarcely to be expected in the near future has been accomplished by our government with its flashing of weapons and their preparation of oppression for the workers, namely, that the unity of the Socialist movement is making gigantic strides."

Meantime the Socialist organization of veterans and present members of the army have been circulating appeals to the soldiers not to act against their fellow workers. The government has arrested numerous persons prominent in the Socialist movement of Holland, for circulating manifestoes containing this appeal. That the agitation among the soldiers has not been in vain is shown by the fact that when the reserves were called out they marched through many streets with a red banner in front.

It is well understood that this movement received its impulse from the German railroad monster, Budde, who has for some time been urging a similar law. The German Social Democracy were quick to light a fire in the rear in order to attract the attention of the German officials who are assisting the Holland exploiters. The *Vorwaerts* has published a series of articles exposing the inhuman conditions existing on the State railroads of Prussia. It has pointed out that for wages of between 50 and 60 cents per day the laborers are required to work from 10 to 16 hours per day with practically no holidays. This overwork has its natural result in a large number of accidents, over 10,000 railroad employes being injured during the past year, one third of this number being killed.

"Het Volk," the organ of the Social Democracy of Holland, succeeded in discovering some secret circulars which had recently been issued by the government, one of which ordered the telegraph authorities not to forward telegrams sent by the unions in relation to the strike. As a final step in the fight the railroad workers hold themselves in readiness to declare a general strike on all the lines in case the proposed law is enacted, and it is this situation which is frightening the government. It is known that in preparation for such a strike a package of instructions has been sent out to the directors of the railroads and to the heads of departments containing three envelopes labeled as follows: The first to be opened at the moment of the outbreak of the strike; the second when the strike has once broken out, and the third when a telegram shall have been received containing a key word which has been secretly transmitted. "Het Volk" has discovered that this key word will be "authority," so that when this word is sent over the wires the Socialist telegraphers will know what to expect.

England.

The most important recent event in England is the meeting of the Labor Representation Committee which takes place about the middle of February. This Committee is supposed to be made up of the representatives from the I. L. P., the Fabian Society, and those unions which desire independent liberal representation. At the beginning the S. D. F. was represented in the conference, but when the conference refused to put itself on record as distinctly Socialist the S. D. F. dropped out. At the meeting just held there was little left to show the Socialist character of the meeting save that some of the most active members of the conference were Socialists. It looks very much as if the Socialism had been gradually dropping out in the effort to elect individuals to office. That the trade unionists see it in the same way is shown by numerous letters written by well known anti-Socialist trade unionists to Reynold's Weekly, complaining that the Labor Representation Committee was simply a scheme to get the trade unionists to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the benefit of the would-be Socialist office holders.

The unemployed problem has been occupying the attention of the English Socialists and the parades of the unemployed which have occupied so much space in the cable dispatches to this country have been organized by the S. D. F. of London. A meeting of the unemployed was held at the Guildhall on Feb. 27 and 28, where the following resolutions were adopted:

"That the responsibility for finding work for the unemployed in each district should be undertaken jointly by the local authorities and by the central government, and that such legislation should be introduced as would empower both central and local authorities to deal adequately with the problem."

"That the Prime Minister be requested to receive a deputation from this Conference in order to lay before him the urgent necessity for the following legislative and administrative proposals:

"(a) That this Conference, realizing that the interests of industry are the paramount interests of the community, and that the problem of the unemployed should be dealt with in a sympathetic as well as in a practical manner, urges upon the government the necessity of appointing a Minister of Industry, with a seat in the Cabinet, one of whose duties it shall be to organize a special department of his office to deal with recurring periods of distress, to watch for and notify indications of approaching lack of employment, to supplement the Board of Trade statistics, to obtain and disseminate information as to places where work can be had, to help in distributing labor where it is most needed, and, above all, to devise and to promote measures for the temporary and permanent utilization of the unemployed labor of the nation.

"(b) That the government forthwith introduce any legislation required, or take any other necessary steps to provide work for the unemployed:

"(1) By carrying into effect the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Port of London.

"(2) By promptly granting loans and any other facilities on the application of local authorities for such purposes as laying out villages near great towns, constructing roads and other means of transit from crowded centers to such villages, reclaiming foreshores, afforesting, establishing, or utilizing farms and other labor colonies, and otherwise providing useful employment at trade union wages and for not more than 48 hours per week.

"(c) That in accordance with the recommendations of the House of Commons Committee of 1895, on Distress from Want of Employment, Boards of Guardians be empowered to give relief to the unemployed during special periods of industrial depression without disfranchising such recipients of relief.

"(d) That all work already decided on, in connection with the military, naval, postal, and other Departments of the Government, be put in hand at the earliest possible moment, and as many workmen as possible be employed thereon."

"That municipal and other local authorities be urged forthwith to take the following steps for coping with distress caused by unemployment:

"(a) By pressing forward all works already decided upon and by employing as many workers as possible on all works in hand, such work to be paid for by the hour or day.

"(b) By taking in hand, by direct labor where practicable, plans for draining and reclaiming foreshores and other waste land, demolishing slums and rehousing the inhabitants in villages on the outskirts of towns or otherwise, and undertaking the many other public works necessary for the health and well-being of the community.

"(c) By establishing Labor Registration Offices charged with ascertaining as accurately as may be the number and occupations of the unemployed, and co-operating with the central Government in finding useful work for such unemployed; the cost of maintenance to be charged upon the rates.

"(d) By opening Municipal Shelters for the homeless unemployed in times of exceptional distress, and if necessary applying to the Local Government Board to sanction expenditure for the same.

"(e) By the consolidation of all the unions in the metropolis into one district for the purposes of the administration of the Poor Law."

"That a permanent National Organization be formed in order to give effect to the decision of the Conference."

Justice, the organ of the Social Democratic Federation of England, reached its one thousandth number on March 14th, and in celebration of this issued an exceedingly large and interesting special number.

France.

Under the pressure of the Socialists of France the government has decided to increase the amount of pensions given to the superannuated and injured miners. Under the old pension law which was enacted under the pressure of the great strike of 1894 there were only 3,000 persons who were eligible to receive a pension of sufficient amount to be of any importance. Under the new law this is increased to over 12,000. This will require an additional expenditure of one million francs, one-third of which will be secured from the mining corporations through an increase in the State rent which they are required to pay and two-thirds comes from the general governmental funds.

Even the organization which was formed especially to represent the Millerand and Jaures position has now repudiated the actions of these men. The Seine federations of the Socialist France at its last meeting passed resolutions censuring Millerand by a vote of 71 to 56, and this resolution was designated as a "first warning." Another resolution which provided for the exclusion of Millerand from the Federation received 52 votes. While an attempt to whitewash the actions of Millerand received only 56 votes, among which nine votes were of members of Millerand's electoral committee.

Switzerland.

The reactionary movement still proceeds. One of the hardest fought battles of the democratic movement in Switzerland was waged in order to secure the right of popular election of teachers in the city of Zurich, and this has recently been abolished by the cantonal council. The Socialist Seidel, who is well known as one of the foremost writers on educational subjects in Europe, Erismann, Pfluger, Ernst, and others have made a strong fight against this movement.

Sweden.

The Swedish organization of young Socialists held a Congress in Stockholm on the 21st and 22d of February. According to the official report the organization has grown from 15 clubs with 500 members in 1901, to 17 clubs with 890 members. Besides this membership there is still a large number of such other clubs which have not yet united with the general organization so that the total membership of the Socialist young men's organization of Sweden is about 2,000.

Belgium.

The Socialists of Belgium have introduced a law to reduce the hours of labor in the mines to nine, and providing that at the end of three years, this shall be further reduced to eight hours.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Social Unrest, by John Graham Brooks. The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 394, pp. \$1.50.

This is a type of book of which we may expect a great many during the next few years. The facts upon which Socialism is based are now so forcing themselves to the front that even the universities can no longer neglect them. But it would not do to admit that the Socialists had seen and interpreted these facts correctly before the economists of the colleges. Under the head of "some generalities," the author brings together many of the things that are disturbing the social equilibrium and points out how the forces of the capitalist and laboring class are massing for battle and comes to the following significant conclusion: "The employers have only to convince organized labor that it cannot hold its own against the capitalist manager, and the whole energy that now goes to the union will turn to an aggressive political Socialism. It will not be the harmless sympathy with increased city and State functions which trade unions already feel; it will become a turbulent political force bent upon using every weapon of taxation against the rich." To be sure his use of the words "turbulent" and "taxation" in the last clause renders it well-nigh meaningless but otherwise he is but confirming the Socialist position. In the same way in his chapter on "Politics and Business," he states the fact of class government quite as plainly as could be wished. "Our magnates of industry," he tells us, "have not preached paternalism, but, in season and out of season, they have practiced it. . . . They have not merely looked to the government to assist their enterprises, they have taken possession of it. . . . No lackey was ever more subservient to his master than Pennsylvania to its railroads, or than the State of California to the Southern Pacific. These corporations have owned the States, as the landlords in England owned the rotten boroughs before the reform."

He points out how completely the Democratic party is affiliated with the small property interests and the Republican party with the large capitalists and gives some interesting instances of the effect of recent developments in the Southern States on this fact.

The chapter on "The Social Unrest" is one of the most valuable in the book because of the historical material which it contains concerning the source and development of class struggles in America. He sums up the difference between the unrest of to-day and that of previous times by pointing out that the discontent of to-day, is not only

discontent plus education; not only discontent plus the press to voice it; it is discontent plus the vote."

The chapter on "Man and Society vs. Machinery," has much very good material on the effect of the machine on the worker, although it makes a ridiculously feeble showing beside the work of many of the minor Socialist writers to say nothing of the material contained in Marx's "Capital."

When he comes to treat directly of Socialism he is much less satisfactory. He gives a history of Socialism with one paragraph devoted to Marx and Marxian economics and in this he shows little understanding of his subject. In "Socialism in the Making," he descends to positive misrepresentation, as where he implies that the French Socialists have done little beside making a "very raw attempt to catch the working class vote by giving away the public money," or that their main boast is the amount they have given for charity. The writer of this spent some time in some of these very cities mentioned in company with the municipal officials and talked with them and read their literature and never saw anything to bear out such a conclusion, while he did see any amount of positive active work being done. But it is very easy to discover the animus of this sort of talk. Professor Brooks is trying to demonstrate that only the "opportunist" wing of the Socialist movement is worthy of consideration and the French municipalities are controlled by the Guesdists,—the French Marxians. When he comes to speak of Jaures and Millerand he is filled with enthusiasm for the "holiest of all crusades" that they are leading against militarism, although up to the present time this crusade has begun and ended in flowery speeches inside and outside the Chamber of Deputies. Then after declaring that the party represented by Jaures is gaining over the ones who are doing the actual work in the municipalities (which is not a fact), he finishes the confusion by referring to this alleged movement as "substituting work for phrases." The chapter "From Revolution to Reform," repeats all the platitudes of the "revisionists" with which Socialists are so familiar. One sentence will show how fair his position is. He says: "Steps in factory legislation that were once jeered at are now approved." It would be news to any Socialist to be told when and where Marx or Engels for example, had ever "jeered at factory legislation."

The discussion of "Socialism at Work" contains much that is valuable concerning the Belgian government, but it is equally disfigured by misleading, not to say dishonest, statements. He continually tells of alleged inconsistencies on the part of the Socialist co-operatives in that they worked some of their employes over eight hours, that they used piece work, etc., and based his criticisms upon the idea that the Socialists really consider the co-operative "Socialism at Work," when he must be well aware of the fact that both in their literature and speeches it is continually pointed out that the co-operative is in no sense of the word Socialism. When the writer of this visited the "Maison du Peuple" in Brussels the guide was very careful to explain to him repeatedly that such work was not to be con-

sidered a part of Socialism, and the manner in which he said the words showed that he was using some oft-repeated phrases.

His attempt to show that the idea of the general strike is now considered as "nonsense" by the Socialists sounds laughable in view of recent events in France, Belgium and Holland. All the cheap and dishonest means of fighting Socialism that have done service these many years are to be found in the book, although they are given a less prominent place than a few years ago. We find insinuations of connection between the "equalitarian" theories of Jefferson and the early Utopians, and modern Socialism, hints concerning a "violent form of Socialism," the worn-out argument against the class struggle drawn from the fact that prominent Socialists have belonged to other classes, etc. In general the weakness of the book lies in the fact that the author depends upon insinuations for his arguments and gossip for his information. It is difficult to answer either but their presentation does not carry conviction to intelligent minds.

Notwithstanding all these glaring defects it is a book that the Socialists may well welcome. In spite of himself the author presents enough of evidence to overthrow his own decisions. It will leave the reader well disposed toward Socialism and will give him considerable valuable information concerning social conditions and the Socialist movement. The reading of some book like Kautsky's "Social Revolution," will serve to brush away any ideas he might get from the book to the effect that Socialism was giving up its revolutionary character, and on the whole it is probable that the book will result in introducing many readers to Socialism who on account of their intellectual snobbery would disdain to begin a study of Socialism by reading what the Socialists themselves had to say.

Shrouds with Pockets, by Henry E. Allen. J. A. Wayland. Paper, illustrated, 120 pp., 25 cents.

A series of striking snap-shots of present society are strung along on the thread of an interesting story. The effect of lack of employment, the oppression of capital, the crushing weight of the trust, the prostitution of our great institutions of learning—all are pictured with considerable power and vividness. The characters of the book are largely given names drawn from the list of well-known Socialist workers, although there would seem to be no attempt to make them act true to the character whose names they are given. The book is well printed on first class book paper, with a large number of photographs of persons prominent in the Socialist and reform movement of America. It should prove a valuable addition to the propaganda literature of Socialism, since it is distinctly different from anything else in the field. There is a utopian point of view pervading the whole book and a tendency to ignore the class struggle position, which together with some attempts to drag in matter on the sex question having no relation to Socialism, constitute the most serious defects of the book.

The Municipality from Capitalism to Socialism, by Ernest Untermann. Appeal to Reason. Paper, 30 pp., five cents.

This is distinctly the best thing yet published on this subject. It gives definiteness to several hitherto loosely used terms, sets forth what must finally come to be the Socialist attitude on municipal problems in a clear and scientific manner. "The development of the municipality shows three distinct stages. The first is the development toward private monopoly. . . . The second stage is what I term municipal capitalism. . . . The third stage is municipal Socialism." These three stages are thoroughly discussed with a wealth of statistical and other information, and the attitude of the Socialist movement toward them is clearly pointed out.

When John Bull Comes A-Courtin', by Lucien V. Rule. Caxton Publishing Company, Louisville, Ky. Paper, fancy cover, thirty pages, fifty cents.

The bards of Socialism are increasing in number and improving in quality daily. This little book of beautifully printed poems contains some that are really gems. Rather than attempt to characterize the whole, we give the following as a sample:

SOCIALISM.

Like a majestic cloud from out the west,
When all the world is sickened with the heat,
She rose with shadowy wings and solace sweet.
And lo, th' unbearable beauty of her breast
Was changed to lightning wrath where men did wrest
The wages of the toiler from his hand,
And dared despoil the widow of the land;
But heavy-laden hearts with dreams were blessed.
And when she spake some trembled at her voice,
While others, wiser, wakened to rejoice.
Her words struck terror to the souls of men,
While others were from very rapture dumb.
Then saw I truth is to him who reads
Or hard or kind according to his deeds.

* * *

Introduction to Socialism, by N. A. Richardson. Appeal to Reason. Paper, forty-six pages, five cents.

This is one more of the very large number of propaganda pamphlets that are coming out all the time. It seems to be somewhat better than the average, is well written, covers the subject quite thoroughly, appeals to both farmer and wage worker and should prove a great help in the capture of the world for Socialism.

Referendum and Initiative in City Government, by John R. Commons, published by Ginn & Co.

This pamphlet is a reprint from the Political Science Quarterly and is largely based upon a distinction which the author draws between the "Political problem" and the "Business problem" in cities. He does not seem to realize that this distinction is unimportant to-day, and is merely a transient phase peculiar to the last years of capitalism when the forces that are struggling for control of the political

power have divergent interests in the business sphere. When government surrenders its function as the ruler of persons and becomes merely an administrator of things with class antagonism abolished, all of his fine spun distinctions will be gone.

Other pamphlets received this month which deserve more than the passing notice which our space enables us to give them are "Socialism the Basis of Universal Peace," by Dr. Howard A. Gibbs; Socialism and the Negro Problem, by Charles H. Vail, both of which are published by the Comrade Publishing Co., and "The Law of Socialism," published by the author, C. Frank Hathaway, of New York City.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

New Socialist Books.

We are happy to announce for immediate publication four new Socialist books, each one of more than ordinary significance. This means two things, first, that American Socialist writers are coming to the front with ideas worth expressing; second, that the co-operative organization of our publishing company has provided the capital necessary to make at least a beginning in the work of putting the best Socialist thought within the reach of the millions of workers who need the Socialist message. This does not mean that the capital now at our disposal is adequate—far from it. We are constantly obliged to reject excellent manuscripts from lack of capital to print them, and some of the greatest Socialist classics are still out of the reach of American readers for lack of the money needed to pay translators and printers. But the work is now on a self-sustaining basis, every dollar of new capital goes not to make up deficits but to increase the variety of literature offered to American Socialists and students of Socialism. The April publications of Charles H. Kerr & Company are as follows:

FEUERBACH: THE ROOTS OF THE SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY.

Comrade Austin Lewis of San Francisco has rendered a notable service to the Socialist movement of the world by the scholarly yet lucid translation and the helpful introduction which he has supplied to this masterly work of Engels. The work itself is so condensed and so full of ideas of the utmost importance to Socialists that we shall make no attempt to summarize it here. It deals with the philosophic basis of Socialism, with the relations of Socialism to religious and "free thought" movements, and with the sentimental ideas which some Socialists even now desire to inject into Socialism. The book is handsomely printed and bound, and is number eight of the Standard Socialist Series. Price 50 cents.

GOD'S CHILDREN. BY JAMES ALLMAN.

This is "a modern allegory" which is beyond any doubt or cavil a work of genius. The reckless audacity of the author's prologue in heaven is startling in the extreme, but it is a fitting introduction to the body of the work. With all his audacity and with all his enthu-

siasm, the author has a saving sense of humor which never leaves him, and even those who are flayed most thoroughly by his satire can not deny the fine literary quality of the work. Those who care nothing for style will delight in the book despite of its good style, for it is full of action—something doing on every page. It will be handsomely printed in large type, prettily bound in cloth, and sold at fifty cents. It will delight every reader with the possible exception of those who are entirely orthodox in their theology, and for these we have a consolation in the book next described.

THE ROOT OF ALL KINDS OF EVIL.

Rev. Stewart Sheldon, a prominent orthodox minister, the father of Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, whose Utopian novels have been so widely read, comes out unequivocally for the Socialist Party in this pamphlet. Moreover, he demonstrates the soundness of his position by a clear and convincing argument, starting from the teachings of Jesus which are at least nominally accepted by all Christians. He shows the ruinous effect of capitalism upon the minds and bodies of the workers, and points out that the remedy must come through the Socialist movement. We can heartily recommend this book to those who wish something stating the religious arguments for Socialism. Paper, 10 cents.

CLASS STRUGGLES IN AMERICA. BY A. M. SIMONS.

Most of the literature of international Socialism takes its historical illustrations from Europe. This is natural in view of the newness of the movement here, yet the history of America, uncomplicated by survivals of feudalism, is richer than the history of any other country in facts proving the truth of the Socialist philosophy. In "Class Struggles in America," A. M. Simons has briefly sketched the economic causes underlying the more conspicuous events of American history, the revolt from England, the civil and foreign wars, the rise and fall of parties, the growth of the colossal trusts, and finally the approaching and inevitable collapse of capitalism and the historic role to be played by the Socialist Party. "Class Struggles in America" is a book that no Socialist can afford to miss, and it will also prove an effective propaganda pamphlet. Paper, 10 cents.

SPECIAL OFFER ON NEW SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE REVIEW.

For one dollar we will send The Review one year to a new name, and will send postpaid any book or books published or imported by us to the amount of one dollar at advertised prices. To any subscriber who wishes to obtain several dollars' worth of books, and has not time to secure a corresponding number of new subscribers before writing, we will, if requested AT THE TIME THE MONEY IS SENT, include with each dollar's worth of books a subscription post-card good for The Review one year to a new name.

What to Read on Socialism.

This propaganda booklet has been newly revised and in great part rewritten, so that in its present form we do not hesitate to recommend it for circulation with a view to making Socialists. The first nine pages have been entirely changed from the former edition, and are now taken up with a statement of the Socialist position in the simplest possible language. The remainder of the book consists in a description of the various Socialist books and pamphlets of merit which are accessible to English readers. These are described in such a way as to enable the reader to make an intelligent selection of the particular books containing the particular information that he is in search of at a particular time. The new edition contains descriptions of twenty of the most important works in the Social Science Series, imported from England, as well as of all the most important American books on Socialism. Mechanically, the booklet is exactly like a number of the Pocket Library of Socialism, but it is supplied at the nominal price of 25 cents a hundred by express, or 50 cents a hundred by mail, while a single copy is sent free to any one requesting it.

The Social Revolution.

A recent issue of the Social Democratic Herald says:

"The Socialist movement in America is distinctly indebted to Kautsky for a large share of the available propaganda matter that it made use of in the days when the work was uphill and small of results and proselytes discouragingly few. Chapters of a former work of his were translated, with some mischievous liberties, it is true, and were used as leaflets and pamphlets. The teachings of these leaflets furnished a good ground work, for those who did not read them slavishly, for a general conception of the principles of Social Democracy. The present work is a riper book by the great German thinker and deserves the widest possible sale. No American Socialist library can be complete without it, and the thanks of our American Socialists are due to Messrs. Kerr & Co. for issuing it in such attractive and readable form, and yet at so reasonable a price. The Socialist press has already published chapters and extracts from it, through the kindness of the publishers in supplying advance proofs, and also portions of the translation by Justice of London have also been presented, so that our readers are more or less familiar with it, and no extended review is necessary at this time. The book is divided into two parts. The first concerns itself with: 'Reform and Revolution.' The second is headed: 'The Day After the Revolution.' The first part is most instructive, yet the greatest interest attaches to the second portion, which will not be found to be as Utopian as its title suggests. It is speculative, of course, but very reasonably so, and the author at the start disarms possible critics by explaining that he does not wish to imply by the words 'the day after' that Socialism is to come full-fledged overnight or that capitalism will cease its control through one fell swoop of an awakened political proletariat. In fact this part is an attempt to show how it will be necessary for the people, once they have gained the control, to proceed in a progressive,

orderly way to reconstruct society. He aims to show that the old criticism of the Socialists that 'the moment they win they are lost,' is not warranted by the probabilities. As we have said, no one should be without this work."

The first edition of "The Social Revolution" is nearly exhausted, and it is selling more rapidly than ever. It is published in the Standard Socialist Series, substantially bound in red cloth, and the price, postage included, is 50 cents, to stockholders 30 cents.

Co-Operation in Publishing Socialist Literature.

A booklet bearing this title, and giving a full account of the organization of our co-operative company, will be mailed to any one requesting it. Address


CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.

Books of Scientific

ALLEN, Henry E. A Study in Government.	\$0.05	—
AVELING, Edward. The Student's Marx.	1.00	—
BELLAMY, Edward. Plutocracy or Nationalism, Which?.....	.05	MARX
BADEN-POWELL, B. H. Village Communities in India.....	1.00	—
BAX, E. Belfort. The Ethics of Socialism..	1.00	MACH
—Outlooks from the New Standpoint..	1.00	L
—Story of the French Revolution.....	1.00	MASSE
—The Religion of Socialism.....	1.00	O
BRANSTEIN, Edward, Ferdinand Lassalle.	1.00	MAYN
BLATCHFORD, Rob't. Britain for the British	.50	MILL
—The same in paper25	S
—Imprudent Marriages.....	.05	MORI
—Merris England.....	.10	ci
BLISS, H. L. Plutocracy's Statistics.....	.10	MORI
BOUROFF, Basil. The Impending Crisis...	.35	at
BROOME, Isaac. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.....	.50	NEW
BROWN, W. I. Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo XIII.....	.02	W
BROWN, Wm. T. After Capitalism, What..	.05	NOY
—The Real Religion of Today.....	.05	S
—The Axe at the Root.....	.05	PERS
—The Relation of Religion to Social Ethics.....	.05	—
CARPENTER, Edward. England's Ideal....	1.00	PLAT
—Civilization, Its Cause and Cure	1.00	—
—Love's Coming-of-Age.....	1.00	ROBE
CORRY, W. A. How I Acquired My Millions	.05	RODS
DARROW, Clarence S. Crime and Criminals	.10	C
—In Memory of John P. Altgeld.....	.05	ROGE
—Realism in Literature and Art.....	.05	SCHA
—Resist Not Evil.....	.75	ci
DAWSON, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism	1.00	SIMO
—German Socialism and Lassalle.....	1.00	—
ENGELS, Frederick. Condition of the English Working Class in 1844.....	1.25	—
—The Origin of the Family50	W
—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific....	.50	—
—The same in paper.....	.10	—
HERRON, Geo. D. Why I Am a Socialist..	.05	—
HINDS, Wm. A. American Communities..	1.00	—
KAUTSKY, Karl. Life of Frederick Engels	.10	SIMO
—The Social Revolution.....	.50	P
KELLEY, J. W. Industrial Democracy....	.05	SOCIA
KERR, Charles H. Morals and Socialism..	.05	SOMB
—The Folly of Being "Good".....	.05	ci
—(Compiler). Socialist Songs.....	.05	TWIN
—Socialist Songs with Music.....	.20	VAIL
KERR, May Walden. Socialism and the Home.....	.05	—
LA FARGUE, Paul. The Evolution of Property.....	1.00	VAND
—Socialism and the Intellectuals05	IN
LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm. No Compromise..	.10	WAT
—Memoirs of Karl Marx.....	.50	WENT
—Socialism, What it is, and What it Seeks to Accomplish.....	.10	IN
LORIA, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society	1.25	WILS
MACKAY, H. W. Boyd. A Sketch of Social Evolution05	pe
MCDILL, J. T. Let's All Get Rich.....	.02	14
MARX, Karl. Capital. Cloth, 847 pages...	2.00	WOOL
		H
		YOUN

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW edited by which every well-informed socialist finds an absolute socialist writers of Europe and America. It is the record of the most vital questions of party policy.

SPECIAL OFFER. For one dollar we will send you one year to a NEW subscriber (one who has never been sent a book or books from the above list to the amount of one dollar).
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY. PUBLISHERS.



THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

MAY, 1903.

NO. 11.

Workingmen As Judges.

WHAT does the cry for a non-partisan or non-political judiciary mean? It means that the Socialists are right when they say that there is no fundamental difference between the republican and democratic branches of the capitalist party; that the pretended fight between them is only a struggle for the offices and the patronage; that both have been tested and found to be thoroughly reliable servants of the non-producing class; and that the so-called business men, that is those whose business it is to take from those whose business it is to produce, are well satisfied with judges drawn from either branch. They know their men. When they say the bench is not a political office they express a wish rather than a fact. They wish the workers to believe that the courts are not used for political purposes and that capitalism is so firmly established on everlasting foundations that all hope of overthrowing it must be abandoned, and that as they make no distinction between republican and democratic judges, so the working class should make no distinction between capitalist and Socialist judges.

If it were true that the bench is not a political office; that the business of the judicial department, one of the three great branches of our government, has become of such a character that the working class is not interested in it and cannot understand it; that there is an impassable gulf between the working class and the courts; then it is a sad commentary on our social development; then we say, so much the worse for the courts, or so much the worse for what is called politics, or, if you please, so much the worse for the condition of the working class as developed under capitalism. But we shall find upon examination that the bench instead of being a non-political office is in fact the most political of all offices.

If judges had only technical matters to deal with, like architects and engineers, it would be proper enough to nominate

only trained lawyers for these offices. But they have to pass upon more important matters than the fine points of pleading, practice and evidence. Let us consider for a moment the character of our laws, the powers of the courts and how these powers are used. The body of our laws is made up of two parts,—first, legislative enactments called statute law; second, decisions of courts, called common law. The statute law is comprised in a single volume; the common law is to be found in tens of thousands of volumes of court reports. This distinction, however, is superfluous, because the few little statute laws are not laws for sure until they have passed into decisions of the courts, so that these decisions, after all, are the whole thing.

At an early day in this country, the courts usurped the power to declare statutes unconstitutional, and thus unconstitutionally set themselves up as the sovereign power over and beyond the reach of the people; for although a judge may be deposed that in no way changes the effect of a decision already rendered. They knew of no other way to meet an unconstitutional statute except by an unconstitutional decision. It never occurred to them to refer a doubtful statute to the real sovereign, the people, to ratify or reject it. This hamstringing of democracy was not done without vigorous protest at the time. Chancellor Kent justified it as necessary to protect the rights of minorities; but it is now used with the avowed object of defeating the rights of majorities. See Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations*, chap. VII, where this question is discussed. Judge Cooley says: "In declaring statutes unconstitutional, the courts only do what every private citizen may do in respect to the mandates of the courts when the judges assume to act and to render judgments or decrees without jurisdiction." There you have the pure and undefiled gospel of anarchy, so characteristic of capitalism.

Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, referring to the Dred Scott case, said: "The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

In England it has not been necessary as yet for the courts to usurp the power of setting aside acts of parliament. The reason is not the lack of a written constitution, as commonly supposed, for Lord Coke asserted the supremacy of the courts over parliament without a constitution. But this supremacy is not now exercised. The reason is obvious. Restricted suffrage and the hereditary

house of lords afford sufficient guaranty against the rule of the people. Remove these two checks and the necessity would at once be felt of placing the ultimate power "somewhere," as our courts queerly express it, meaning somewhere beyond the reach of the people, somewhere besides in the people themselves.

To avoid the appearance of partiality and to maintain their reputation for being "non-partisan," the courts not only reverse the legislature, but also reverse themselves. In fact, it is a peculiar advantage of court-made law that it is flexible. It can be either followed or overruled, as the occasion demands. Former decisions are not binding, except in the particular suits in which they were rendered. There is no law preventing a court either from overruling an old precedent or establishing a new one, if wanted. The federal income tax of 1894 was illegal because though there was precedent for it the court refused to follow the precedent. Sweeping and revolutionary injunctions are issued against labor unions, because though there is no precedent for them, a new precedent is wanted. But an injunction to restrain employers from endangering the health and lives of their workmen cannot be granted, first, because there is no old precedent for it and no new precedent is wanted; second, because even if there were a precedent for it the precedent would be bad and would not be followed.

The result is that our judges form a kind of hierarchy, and their law is a mystic lore capable of the most wonderful constructions. If you asked a Grecian priestess, sitting on a three-legged stool in the Delphic temple, a plain question, her answer would be so ambiguous that however the affair afterwards turned out an interpretation of her answer could always be found to fit the event, and this, of course, was the right interpretation; all others were wrong. Ask a plain question of a capitalist judge, sitting in a high-backed, four-legged chair in the temple of Justice, and he will deliver you a grave oracle about what is right, what is fair, what is just, what is honest, what is reasonable, what is moral, what is equity, what is good faith, what is public welfare, and all this nauseating stuff, which means nothing, because it may mean anything which it is handy to have it mean on future occasions. But you come before this judge with a case based on specific facts, involving a vital point between the subject class and their exploiters, and you will quickly find out what the ambiguous words mean. You will find that the public welfare always and everywhere in the last instance means the mastery of the non-producing class over the producing class, and the consequent degradation and suffering of the latter. That is, the public welfare of the capitalist class means the public suffering of the working class. This is honest, this is fair, this is just. No other form of

justice is conceivable, except justice for the non-producer and injustice for the producer. In a society where labor power is treated as merchandise, there is no way of protecting capitalist property except by confiscating labor property and no way of protecting labor property except by confiscating capitalist property. Hence the agents of capitalism, whose hands are red up to the elbows with the blood of confiscated labor, are the loudest in their denunciation of any attempt to abolish capitalism as being confiscation. The permanent question before the courts is not the negative one, how to protect property; it does no good to protect property; if protected and left severely alone property soon melts away. The question is a positive one,—how to keep up a steady confiscation of labor. Unless this can be done there is no object in owning capital, as capital is only useful as a means of confiscating labor. And this affirmative assistance is what the courts in effect render to capitalists.

The courts also control the very important subject of taxation. They set aside an unwelcome tax on the ground that it was not levied for a public purpose, and they themselves are the sole and final judges of what is a public purpose. The people are not competent to decide this; they need somebody to tell them.

This judicial priesthood is the bane of all Anglo-Saxon countries. They are judge-ridden. It is a common remark that a complicated system of laws seems inseparable from what is called political liberty, i. e. bourgeois liberty. This merely means that the transfer of supreme power from the executive to the judicial branch of the government necessitates a multiplicity of regulations in order to blind the people to the fact that a court despotism is just as essentially a despotism as a military despotism, though different in form. The producing class is as effectually crushed under the one as the other. True, political liberty gives to the producing class the means to free itself, but it still remains subject until it learns how to use these means for the purpose of recovering and retaining sovereignty over itself; it is not enough to shift it from one branch of the government to another.

Our courts not only have a veto on the legislative branch of the government, but they have control over the executive branch. The so-called executive branch does not execute the laws. There is no provision made anywhere in our system, for the faithful execution of the laws, and that is why so many of them remain unexecuted and why so many private societies spring up among people who have a fad for seeing some favorite law executed, but are indifferent about other laws. A society for the prevention of cruelty to animals is all right; but imagine, if you can, the great business men of Chicago, heads of corporations, bankers, preachers, leaders in church and fashionable life, forming a voluntary

association to look after the faithful execution of the tax laws, the listing of property at its full value and the assessment of all church-owned property not used for strictly religious purposes, as required by law? Wouldn't it jar you?

What our executive branch does is not to execute the laws but to execute the orders of court. You may neglect a law with impunity, but you neglect an order of court and you are put behind the bars forthwith. In the last instance, therefore, our courts control both legislature and executive, and in fact rule the country, not because of any technical knowledge pertaining to court practice, which is an incidental matter, but because they usurp the power to decide public controversies in favor of the exploiting class.

Not only do the courts control the legislature and the executive; their power extends to all kinds of contracts between individuals. They can either annul contracts or enforce them as they see fit. They allow and enforce waivers of exemptions and many other legal rights, which the legislature attempts to secure to the weaker party. They assume to say what is an equitable contract. But there is one class of contracts which they exclude from the temple of justice; such are the contracts between employer and employe. When the laborer comes and asks them to pass on the fairness of this contract, they slam the door in his face. Anything is fair against the working class. To make money out of brother capitalists is stealing or cheating, and if carried too far the courts will interfere to stop it. There is only one strictly legitimate and honorable way of making money, and that is to make it out of the working class. So long as a man confines himself to this field he will not be interfered with. There is no law limiting the exploitation of labor. It would be unconstitutional to do that.

As the real supremacy of the courts in our system and their effectiveness in thwarting democracy becomes more generally recognized, no wonder that the salaries of judges are raised and that the dignity of the bench is rising in the eyes of the capitalists. No wonder the Chicago Bar Association, otherwise so barren and impotent, has introduced the custom that all present rise to their feet on the entrance of the judge, and that we hear suggestions of a judge's gown, to put his apparent dignity in keeping with his real power. But as the courts rise in the estimation of the capitalists they justly sink in the eyes of the working class and become more and more an object of suspicion and distrust, as their attitude and leanings in the class struggle become more unmistakable.

Such being the powers of the courts and their way of using them, what shall we say about the fitness of workingmen for this

office? The principal business of the courts does not concern the relations of capitalists among themselves; these matters swell the volume of judicial proceedings, but the fundamentally important function of the courts is to assist the owning class to confiscate labor and thus maintain class supremacy.

Loria well says: "Now this part of the law (affecting the relations of capitalists with each other) presents a deep impress of equity and thus give countenance for the moment to the idea that the law is indeed the realization of justice. But this is simply due to the fact that these legal provisions regulate the affairs of men who are economically equal—or at least enjoy a liberty of choice—and among whom usurpation is excluded. But as soon as we turn our attention to the legal provisions regulating the relations between proprietors and non-proprietors we perceive at once that our former concept was but an infantile delusion; for this side of the law shows us an obstinate, impudent and thorough consecration of privilege and a decisive preference for property rights."

Now, in all matters involving issues between the capitalist class and the labor class, being the only vital matters which a court has to pass upon, why are not class-conscious workingmen fully capable of acting as judges, even though they are not lawyers? In fact, the ordinary training which a lawyer receives poorly fits him to act as judge in such matters. The best protection the working class can have is judges elected from its own ranks, whose minds are not befuddled by queer theories about capitalist human nature and capitalist justice as the final and eternal form of all development.

In so far as it is proper to speak of law as a science at all, it is such only as applied to the relations of the exploiters of labor among themselves, as regulating and keeping within bounds the quarrels of the robbers over their booty. It is probable that workingmen would at first make some mistakes in acting as referees in these contests, from lack of familiarity with the rules of the game. But what possible harm would be done anyway? The mistakes would only affect the relations of capitalists among one another and would not harm the working class. But when we come to the relations of the exploiters with the laborers themselves, questions involving class issues, there is no such thing as a science of law, and no previous judicial knowledge or experience is necessary. It is purely a question of political or judicial power, as it was formerly a question of physical force. It is only necessary to know the difference between the class which produces without getting and the class which gets without producing; and a working class judge could make no mistake here; he would be thoroughly qualified, both by knowledge and experience,

to decide questions arising between these two classes. Those fundamental parts of the constitution which are now contemptuously brushed aside by the courts as being intended for effect only, would then be made effectual.

Workingmen are waking up to the fact that the principal purpose of the military forces is to assist employers in time of strikes, and a great cry has been raised over the new militia bill passed by Congress, which gives the President extraordinary powers with reference to the use of the militia. It is well to make a note of such laws. But do not get excited. The executive will not use the powers of the new militia law except to enforce the orders of the court, as in the Debs' strike of 1894. We have no reason as yet to fear the Man on Horseback in this country. He is superfluous. What we already have here is the Judge on Horseback; and the meekness with which the American people bow their heads and submit to court-made and unauthorized law speaks volumes for the thoroughness with which the plutocracy of England and America has done its work of overawing and perverting the minds of the workers, so that they no longer distinguish between what is law and what is only the dictum of a law-breaking judge.

Marcus Hitch.

Contradictory Teachers.*

TWO remarkable books recently published are Ghent's "Our Benevolent Feudalism," and Brooks' "The Social Unrest." These two books should be read together if the reader would extract the full value from either. The reader who may be interested in social questions will take huge delight in them, not alone because they are filled with the very latest and most significant industrial and political facts, but because the opposite sides of the great labor problem are expounded by two men, each devoting himself with apprehension to the side he hopes will be beaten.

It would appear that they have set themselves the task of collating, as a warning, the phenomena of two counter social forces. Mr. Ghent, who is sympathetic with the Socialist movement, follows with cynic fear every aggressive act of the capitalist class. Mr. Brooks, who yearns for the perpetuation of the capitalist system as long as possible, follows with grave dismay each aggressive act of the labor and Socialist organizations. Mr. Ghent traces the emasculation of labor by capital, and Mr. Brooks traces the emasculation of independent competing capital by labor. In short, each marshals the facts of a side in the two sides which go to make a struggle so great that even the French Revolution is insignificant beside it; for this later struggle, for the first time in the history of struggles, is not confined to any particular portion of the globe, but involves the whole of it.

Starting on the assumption that society is at present in a state of flux, Mr. Ghent sees it rapidly crystallizing into a status, which can best be described as something in the nature of a benevolent feudalism. He laughs to scorn any immediate realization of the Marxian dream, while Tolstoyan utopias and Kropotkinian communistic unions of shop and farm are too wild to merit consideration. The coming status which Mr. Ghent depicts, is a class domination by the capitalists. Labor will take its definite place as a dependent class, living in a condition of machine servitude fairly analogous to the land servitude of the middle ages. That is to say, labor will be bound to the machine, though less harshly, in fashion somewhat similar to that in which the earlier serf was bound to the soil. As he says: "Bondage to the land was the basis of villeinage in the old regime; bondage to the job will be the basis of villeinage in the new."

At the top of the new society will tower the magnate, the new feudal baron; at the bottom will be found the wastrels and inefficient. The new society he grades as follows:

*Our Benevolent Feudalism. By W. J. Ghent. The Macmillan Company. The Social Unrest. By John Graham Brooks. The Macmillan Company.

I. The barons, graded on the basis of possessions.

II. The court agents and retainers. (This class will include the editors of "respectable" and "safe" newspapers, the pastors of "conservative" and "wealthy" churches, the professors and teachers in endowed colleges and schools, lawyers generally, and most judges and politicians.)

III. The workers in pure and applied science, artists and physicians.

IV. The entrepreneurs, the managers of the great industries, transformed into a salaried class.

V. The foremen and superintendents. This class has heretofore been recruited largely from the skilled workers, but with the growth of technical education in schools and colleges, and the development of fixed caste, it is likely to become entirely differentiated.

VI. The villeins of the cities and towns, more or less regularly employed, who do skilled work and are partially protected by organization.

VII. The villeins of the cities and towns who do unskilled work and are unprotected by organization. They will comprise the laborers, domestics, and clerks.

VIII. The villeins of the manorial estates, of the great farms, the mines, and the forests.

IX. The small-unit farmers (land owning), the petty tradesmen, and manufacturers.

X. The subtenants of the manorial estates and great farms (corresponding to the class of "free tenants" in the old Feudalism).

XI. The cotters.

XII. The tramps, the occasionally employed, the unemployed—the wastrels of city and country.

"The new Feudalism, like most autocracies, will foster not only the arts, but also certain kinds of learning—particularly the kinds which are unlikely to disturb the minds of the multitude. A future Marsh or Cope or Le Conte will be liberally patronized and left free to discover what he will; and so, too, an Edison or a Marconi. Only they must not meddle with anything relating to social science."

It must be confessed that Mr. Ghent's arguments are cunningly contrived and arrayed. They must be read to be appreciated. As an example of his style, which at the same time generalizes a portion of his argument, the following may well be given:

"The new Feudalism will be but an orderly outgrowth of present tendencies and conditions. All societies evolve naturally

out of their predecessors. In sociology, as in biology, there is no cell without a parent cell. The society of each generation develops a multitude of spontaneous and acquired variations, and out of these, by a blending process of natural and conscious selection, the succeeding society is evolved. The new order will differ in no important respects from the present, except in the completer development of its more salient features. The visitor from another planet who had known the old and should see the new would note but few changes. *Alter et Idem*—another yet the same—he would say. From magnate to baron, from workman to villein, from publicist to court agent and retainer, will be changes of state and function so slight as to elude all but the keenest eyes."

And in conclusion, to show how benevolent and beautiful this new feudalism of ours will be, Mr. Ghent says: "Peace and stability it will maintain at all hazards; and the mass, remembering the chaos, the turmoil, the insecurity of the past, will bless its reign. . . . Efficiency—the faculty of getting things—is at last rewarded as it should be, for the efficient have inherited the earth and its fulness. The lowly, "whose happiness is greater and whose welfare is more thoroughly conserved when governed than when governing," as a twentieth-century philosopher said of them, are settled and happy in the state which reason and experience teach is their God-appointed lot. They are comfortable, too; and if the patriarchial ideal of a vine and fig tree for each is not yet attained, at least each has his rented patch in the country or his rented cell in a city building. Bread and the circus are freely given to the deserving, and as for the undeserving, they are merely reaping the rewards of their contumacy and pride. Order reigns, each has his justly appointed share, and the state rests in security, 'lapt in universal law.'"

Mr. Brooks, on the other hand, sees rising and dissolving and rising again in the social flux the ominous forms of a new society which is the direct antithesis of a benevolent feudalism. He trembles at the rash intrepidity of the capitalists who fight the labor unions, for by such rashness he greatly fears that labor will be driven to express its aims and strength in political terms, which terms will inevitably be Socialistic terms.

To keep down the rising tide of Socialism, he preaches greater meekness and benevolence to the capitalists. No longer may they claim the right to run their own business, to beat down the laborer's standard of living for the sake of increased profits, to dictate terms of employment to individual workers, to wax righteously indignant when organized labor takes a hand in their business. No longer may the capitalist say "my" business, or even think "my" business; he must say "our" business,

and think "our" business as well, accepting labor as a partner whose voice must be heard. And if the capitalists do not become more meek and benevolent in their dealings with labor, labor will be antagonized and will proceed to wreak terrible political vengeance, and the present social flux will harden into a status of Socialism.

Mr. Brooks dreams of a society at which Mr. Ghent sneers as "a slightly modified individualism, wherein each unit secures the just reward of his capacity and service." To attain this happy state, Mr. Brooks imposes circumspection upon the capitalists in their relations with labor. "If the Socialistic spirit is to be held in abeyance in this country, businesses of this character (anthracite coal-mining) must be handled with extraordinary caution." Which is to say, that to withstand the advance of Socialism, a great and greater measure of Mr. Ghent's benevolence will be required.

Again and again, Mr. Brooks reiterates the danger he sees in harshly treating labor. "It is not probable that employers can destroy unionism in the United States. Adroit and desperate attempts will, however, be made, if we mean by unionism the undisciplined and aggressive fact of vigorous and determined organizations. If capital should prove too strong in this struggle, the result is easy to predict. The employers have only to convince labor that it cannot hold its own against the capitalist manager, and the whole energy that now goes to the union will turn to an aggressive political Socialism. It will not be the harmless sympathy with increased city and state functions which trade unions already feel; it will become a turbulent political force bent upon using every weapon of taxation against the rich."

"The most concrete impulse that now favors Socialism in this country is the inane purpose to deprive labor organizations of the full and complete rights that go with federated unionism."

"That which teaches a union that it cannot succeed as a union turns it toward Socialism. In long strikes in towns like Marlboro and Brookfield strong unions are defeated. Hundreds of men leave these town for shoe-centers like Brockton, where they are now voting the Socialist ticket. The Socialist Mayor of this city tells me, 'The men who come to us now from towns where they have been thoroughly whipped in a strike are among our most active working Socialists.' The bitterness engendered by this sense of defeat is turned to politics, as it will throughout the whole country, if organization of labor is deprived of its rights."

"This enmity of capital to the trade union is watched with glee by every intelligent Socialist in our midst. Every union

that is beaten or discouraged in its struggle is ripening fruit for Socialism."

"The real peril which we now face is the threat of a class conflict. If capitalism insists upon the policy of outraging the saving aspiration of the American workman to raise his standard of comfort and leisure, every element of class conflict will strengthen among us."

"We have only to humiliate what is best in the trade union, and then every worst feature of Socialism is fastened upon us."

This strong tendency in the ranks of the workers toward Socialism, is what Mr. Brooks characterizes the "social unrest;" and he hopes to see the Republican, the Cleveland Democrat and the conservative and large property interests "band together against this common foe," which is Socialism. And he is not above feeling grave and well-contained satisfaction wherever the Socialist doctrinaire has been contradicted by men attempting to practice co-operation in the midst of the competitive system, as in Belgium.

Nevertheless, he catches fleeting glimpses of an extreme and tyrannically benevolent feudalism very like to Mr. Ghent's, as witness the following:

"I asked one of the largest employers of labor in the South if he feared the coming of the trade union. 'No,' he said, 'it is one good result of race prejudice, that the negro will enable us in the long run to weaken the trade union so that it cannot harm us. We can keep wages down with the negro, and we can prevent too much organization.'

"It is in this spirit that the lower standards are to be used. If this purpose should succeed, it has but one issue—the immense strengthening of a plutocratic administration at the top, served by an army of high-salaried helpers, with an elite of skilled and well-paid workmen, but all resting on what would essentially be a serf class of low-paid labor and this mass kept in order by an increased use of military force."

In brief summary of these two notable books, it may be said that Mr. Ghent is alarmed (though he does not flatly say so) at the too-great social restfulness in the community, which is permitting the capitalists to form the new society to their liking; and that Mr. Brooks is alarmed (and he flatly says so) at the social unrest which threatens the modified individualism into which he would like to see society evolve. Mr. Ghent beholds the capitalist class rising to dominate the state and the working class; Mr. Brooks beholds the working class rising to dominate the state and the capitalist class. One fears the paternalism of a class; the other the paternalism of the mass.

Jack London.

Laborism, Impossibilism and Socialism.

IN Great Britain we are only just now entering upon the daily, practical work of a Socialist party. The reasons why we are so far behind all other civilized nations, including even the United States, I gave at length in the first number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW of Chicago, and there is no need to repeat them here. It is enough for us to know that not only are the English and Scotch workers behindhand in education, but that they still, for the most part, look at their own questions from the point of view of the dominant class; confine their attention to maintaining or increasing their rate of wages; refuse to work out the facts before them to their logical conclusion; and are as a rule incapable of conceiving or working for the attainment of any ideal. It has taken us, consequently, two and twenty years of assiduous propaganda to get as far as we have, and if we gauge our progress not by the actual numbers of enrolled Socialists—the only safe test, I admit, for actual working capacity—but by the spread of our ideas, we have got a great deal farther than many of us think. I do not doubt myself, either, that the near future will witness the consolidation of a definite working-class Social-Democratic party in the House of Commons. We are at the moment in a period of transition when, having rendered ourselves more or less formidable, it is worth the while of existing political factions, and especially worth the while of the capitalist-Liberal political faction to try to take advantage of the enthusiasm we can arouse without in any way committing themselves to the principles which constitute the basis of our propaganda. That was to be expected. It was natural. But it is not at all dangerous if genuine Socialists are true to themselves. For when once any body of politicians get on to the inclined plane which leads to Socialism, they will discover that it is a well-greased declivity on which they cannot stop till they reach the bottom. They may occasion us a little temporary annoyance, and postpone our triumphant progress for a short time; but this will not last long. When, for instance, the leaders of the Liberal faction clamor for the expropriation of Lord Penrhyn in order to meet and satisfy in some degree the demands of their "Labor" nominees, they do us excellent service. For if Penrhyn is to be expropriated, why not Furness, why not Cadbury, why not the Railway boards who monopolize our railways? Why, indeed? It is a fine educative word that "expropriation," and the idea is still more enlightening than its method

of expression. In fact, we owe our best thanks to the owner of Bethesda for his staunch upholding of his "right to do what he likes with his own," sorry as we are for the men who suffer. Of course, Bannerman and his set don't mean business in the Penrhyn matter. But what of that? They never do. All the same, however, the proposal has been made, and it is for us to push it a great deal further than the mere political tricksters intend.

No, the difficulty at present is not so much, it seems to me, with outsiders or with the general course of events. Things are coming our way as fast as they can. Everywhere, in all civilized countries, it is obvious that Socialism is the power of the near future. The anxiety of the landlords and capitalists to "dish" us is a testimony to our growing strength. Their desire to bring about splits and schisms in our ranks is evidence of fear. Their dodgery of putting forward trade union barristers, who sell their tongues for money in the courts during the day, and for position in the House of Commons at night, with others of the like kidney, as "Labor Members," is part of a careful scheme to cajole the workers, and head back the Socialists, which serves at the same time as clear proof that they feel very uneasy. Their steady refusal to discuss the existing position in public, and the determination of their corrupt press to boycott our meetings tell the same story. So, I say, the outlook generally is not unsatisfactory, especially when taken in conjunction with the desperate eagerness of the Tories to crush trade unions, and to wreck as they think the only chance of real national education. Our enemies know we are gaining ground daily, and that they are unable to meet us in fair fight. Consequently, suppression of working-class organizations, and the fostering of ignorance, hypocritical sympathy, and pretended co-operation are the order of the day.

Now is the time, therefore, when we might take advantage of the opportunities which the economic and social development and our own propaganda have created for us. But we are prevented, I repeat, not so much by the dexterous action of our opponents as by the lack of consolidation on our own side. There are the deliberate opportunists and hand-to-mouthers, the half-loaf men who are hungry for political sawdust, and who imagine that they can help to carry Socialism by forswearing all its principles, on the one hand; and there are the furious impossibilists with their anarchical absurdities, partly engendered by the surrenderers themselves, on the other. The latter are the more annoying: the former the more injurious.

As to the impossibilists, they are many of them at bottom anarchists, who honestly believe that all political action is harm-

ful. They are justified in holding that opinion, if they so believe; but they are certainly out of place in a political Socialist party. There are others who know as well as we do that political action is unavoidable, but then it must be conducted wholly in the way which they approve. They refuse to accept the ruling of the majority of the organizations they belong to, they vilify everybody who differs from them, and they say what they know perfectly well to be untrue about the men with whom they claim to be working. De Leon, who was a man of ability, and did good work in his time, is the worst specimen of this type, and he has carefully destroyed his own party and driven away all its best men. Even Socialists like Guesde and Lafargue, whose services to the Socialist cause in France are universally recognized, have gone too far in the same direction, with the result that they have played into the hands of their opponents and have lost their hold on great cities where the Parti Ouvrier was formerly supreme. At present, impossibilism in Great Britain is represented by small knots of men, here and there, who without the slightest claim to have shared in the heavy work of the past, most of which was done before they were born, think they can improve the situation by declaring that the S. D. F. does not preach the class-war, as Kropotkin always used to say we clung to the wages system, and by pretending that the "officials" of the party prevent the development of their genius. Criticism all expect and are the wiser for, but mere lying and slander are much better got rid of and dealt with outside.

The impossibilists are thus to a large extent the excuse for the trimmers. The latter can point to the others as hopeless people, with whom none can possibly work who has the slightest respect for the movement or for himself. They strengthen the position of such a man as Millerand, for instance, by misrepresenting the action taken by the great majority of Socialists at the International Congress who never approved of Millerand's action at all, and by affirming that never, under any conceivable set of circumstances, not even with the approval of the overwhelming majority of Socialists, can a Socialist join a transition government for a temporary object. More than this, people of this sort are never happy unless they are endeavoring to reduce all organized action to an absurdity by insisting upon everything which is done being made public at the time.

Who can wonder that, the tendency to trimming and compromise in this country being what it is, those who do not thoroughly understand Socialism, or who are convinced that it is not even partially realizable in our day, should be confirmed in their bootless opportunism by this sort of folly, little as there may be

of it? Obviously, we have to work in the world as we find it, and, although we must retain our definite class-war principles and organization, it is as ridiculous to say that we must never co-operate with people who partly agree with us, as it is ruinous to sink ourselves in a flabby sort of Laborism which has no principles that it can or dare formulate, and no policy which it is willing to avow. "Laborism," with or without Liberalism, is not Socialism, nor anything approaching to it. Impossibilism, with or without Anarchism, is not Socialism, nor anything approaching to it. The soundest exponent of active political Socialism in our time was old Wilhelm Liebknecht. He made mistakes like the rest of us, or he would never have made anything at all; but he kept throughout to the main road of practical, determined, class-war propaganda, using all the means which came to his hand to help on the great cause. It seems to me that we have reached a period in the English Socialist movement when we have to emulate his readiness to combine with all Socialists who are genuinely determined to obtain possession of the great means of production and distribution for the whole people, and to push aside relentlessly, as he did, the cranks and impossibilists who think that they must be right because they never agree with the mass of their fellows.—*H. M. Hyndman, in London "Justice."*

Causes of Social Progress.

MANY recent writers on social progress have adopted what is called the economic interpretation of history. This is the view taken by Carl Marx and summed up by him in the statement that "all social institutions are the result of growth and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in any idea but in the conditions of material existence."

This view is developed and defended by May Wood Simons in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* for March. The article starts out with the statement that "the standpoint from which one approaches the study of history is of the first importance. All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress. What is the reason for great changes in human thought and human life? What is the underlying motive force in social action?"

The only standpoint from which one can properly approach the study of any subject is the standpoint of the truth-seeker. If one is to study a question with a view to get at the bottom facts, he must divest himself of all preconceptions and come to his work with a mind not only open to truth from every quarter, but looking to every quarter for whatever may be found. He must not come with a theory already formed and seek for facts which may give it a show of support.

The questions with which the writer of this article referred to follows her opening statement indicates that she was no longer seeking truth, but felt herself prepared to impart truth to others. She has evidently answered to her own satisfaction each and all of the questions which she here raises. She had found the one cause of social progress, the one reason for great changes in human thought and human life, the one underlying motive force in social action in the "conditions of material existence" and "not in any idea" or ideas whatever.

And yet, assuming this to be her actual conviction, one is at a loss to understand why she should come before the world with this particular idea,—why she should be giving her whole life in a spirit of genuine devotion and sacrifice to the promulgation of socialistic ideas. Evidently this is a dominant conviction, which no philosophy of social progress can quite dispel, that ideas do play a part, and a very important part, in the work of social evolution. The contention that they do not puts one very much in the attitude of those who claim that "nothing is certain,"—a statement which is evidently self-refuting, since the statement itself

can only be true on the supposition that one thing at least is certain,—viz., that “nothing is certain,”—an utterly contradictory conclusion.

The attempt to find one cause of social progress, one reason for the changes which take place in human thought and human life, one underlying motive force in social action, is like trying to trace the Mississippi to a single source. The waters that have been recently making such havoc in the South country,—such changes in human conditions and human laws,—do not take their rise in any one spring or any one lake. No one lake or spring can be said to be dominant even in the changes which the mighty river—made up from a thousand lesser streams—is working.

Undoubtedly economic causes have been too largely overlooked in the past. But they have never been absent or inoperative. Why have they not more generally brought about the changes to which they have steadily pointed and tended? If the causes of social changes are not to be sought in any idea or ideas, but only in material conditions, why have not material conditions uniformly effected these needed changes?

Evidently because men have not understood the workings or meanings of the economic forces and laws amid which and under which they have lived. That is, the ideas which those forces and laws warrant and to which they have been steadily pointing and tending have not been understood or realized. They have been hidden or obscured by other and contradictory ideas, and so the mental or mind forces of the race have not been free to study the workings of economic law and to make clear the pathway of individual and social progress.

Economic laws and forces have been at work in all ages and among all peoples, but there has been no uniformity of growth or progress even among peoples similarly conditioned as to soil and climate. I am not speaking of knowledge of these laws and forces, but of the laws and forces themselves. Knowledge of these takes us at once into the realm of ideas, and the contention of the philosophy we are combatting is that the causes of social growth are not to be sought in any idea but “in the conditions of material existence.”

The conditions of material existence have been substantially the same in China for thousands of years. Economic laws and forces have steadily demanded changes which have never been effected. Why? Because the people have been dominated by ideas and institutions which have tended to perpetuate the existing order.

And the same thing to a lesser degree has retarded the march of progress in our own country. Unquestionably, the nature of the universe, which includes human nature and human environ-

ment, involves a relation between material conditions and human development or social progress. Economics is the science of these relations,—the science by which man learns to adjust himself to his material surroundings in a way to make them contribute in the highest degree to his development and happiness. Ethics is the science of human relations—the science by which man learns how best to adjust himself to his fellow-man,—how to make the most and the best of himself and to get the most and the best out of his neighbor. Religion is the science of man's relations to the universe,—to that invisible, indefinable, power, energy, intelligence,—call it what you will,—which is back of all phenomena and manifests itself through them; to that which is the source and soul of all force, all order and all law; to that which awakens in us a sense of dependence, of confidence, of love.

Economics, ethics and religion, therefore, are inseparably related. The view which a man holds in any one of these departments of thought has much to do in shaping his views of other departments, and the views which really root themselves in convictions, or which become forceful to act strongly on his hopes or fears, are the views which determine action. Sometimes the religious idea is the dominant force, sometimes the ethical and sometimes the economic. Very rarely does either operate unmodified by the others. The causes of social progress, therefore, are not to be found wholly in material conditions. They are to be found also in the social and religious nature of man.

Animals have the same material conditions, so far as soil, climate and environment generally are concerned, as man. Why do they not make the same social progress? Some of them are quite as social or gregarious in their habits as man, but so far as we know their habits, customs, institutions—if one may so speak—are just what they were thousands of years ago. They have made no improvements in the matter of shelter, in their method of procuring or preparing food, or in guarding against want in the future. They have devised no labor-saving inventions, no new means of communication or transportation, and so far as we know, have no closer relations with their fellows in other parts of the world and no more knowledge of them than they had thousands of years ago.

Why is this, if the causes of social progress lie wholly in material conditions? They do not. They trace back into the essential nature of man, and into the character and purpose of the universe as revealed or embodied in the very constitution of man's being. Perhaps it is better to say embodied than revealed, because knowledge of this character and purpose comes slowly, comes only in the degree in which man attains to a **knowledge of himself and his environment**, only as he comes

to know the laws which condition his life, and to understand the relations which subsist between him and his fellows. Were it not for the ideas and thoughts awakened in man by the phenomena of the universe and by his experience under its laws, all the material conditions of his life would leave him as untouched and unmoved as they leave the brute. Having the nature which he has, his experience under law enables him not only to avoid doing that he has found to be injurious and to repeat that which has proven beneficial, as the brutes may do, but to discover relations and deduce principles of action which may come to guide him in matters where experience has not yet been had. The brute cannot go so far. It is in the discovery of relations and in the formation of principles of action rooted in these relations that we are to find the causes of social changes. Institutions are only expressed and embodied ideas. Ideas invariably precede, contemplate and effect the changes. It is not true, therefore, to say that the causes of social progress "are not to be sought in any idea, but in the conditions of material existence."

The writer of the article under consideration says "the old conception of society viewed history as a series of biographies of the great men who had successively appeared and drawn society onward. This was the "one man theory." From this viewpoint Martin Luther was reckoned as the one person who by force of character and strength of will brought about the Reformation." This view,—which no one perhaps would be quite ready to father,—the writer declares unwarranted. "Martin Luther was but the person whom conditions had produced, and that the tide of events bore to the top and made its mouthpiece. He in himself had no power to stay or bring a reformation. Years before other priests had said the same as Luther, but their words had no effect for economic conditions were not ripe for change." How does the writer know that their words had no effect? How does she know that they did not help to make conditions ripe and to prepare the people for the fuller and stronger message which Luther brought?

Granted that the old forms of Feudalism had been giving way, that a new individualism had been coming into existence, how does the writer know that ideas of something better, juster, more human and brotherly, were not at the root of this social growth, furnishing the chief nutriment and inspiration from which it sprang?

The same questions may be asked touching the conditions respecting the work of Cromwell, and Napoleon. Of course, conditions that made these men possible and gave them their opportunity had been gathering for generations. But how does

she know that ideas, ideas of brotherhood and justice, had not a hand in shaping the material which those men had the power to organize and use? How does she know that these men themselves did not contribute by their thought and influence to determine in large measure conditions which followed? What right has she to draw the conclusion that "Society, then, is not advanced to higher planes through the influence of individual great men?" Of course, individual great men are not the sole factors, perhaps not the chief factors, in any great social advance, but they surely constitute a power that no student of history can afford to ignore. And this not because they are great men simply, but because, being great men, they have power to give form and vigor to ideas which are held by the people, but held so vaguely and loosely that they have no organizing or building power.

Great social changes do indeed arise from causes which strike roots deep down in the life of the mass of the people, but these causes are not simply material conditions of existence. They are convictions and feelings which create a divine discontent with conditions which shut men out from their natural rights, and rob them of the higher and nobler enjoyments to which they aspire. Men who have no aspiration for the higher human, who care only for comfort and pleasure, do not furnish the material for social advances. They are ready to be the hirelings of those who would keep them as they are, ready to murder their fellow toilers for pay, and protect the vested interests of the men who keep them in degradation. The men who are working their way out of present conditions, who are seeking economic advancement, and seeking it with a persistence and devotion that are commanding the respect of the nation, are men with ideas of right and justice which they wish to embody in laws and institutions.

The decision of the recent strike commission is on the whole a great tribute to the labor organizations concerned in that struggle. These organizations were not above criticism, not wholly free from reproach, but their attitude on the whole showed a degree of fair-mindedness—a regard for right and justice, which placed them ethically far above the operators.

Our writer says: "Heretofore history had no continuity. It was conceived of as a series of isolated stages. There was no attempt to point out the growth from one stage to another,—no effort to trace the thread of progress, or the line of cause and effect that runs through society."

This is largely true, but the inference she wishes us to draw is wholly unwarranted. It does not at all follow that the economic interpretation of history is the only one that shows or can show continuity. Of course, no interpretation of history can

be valid that ignores the economic. The economic is inseparably woven with the ethical and religious, and no interpretation of history can be just or adequate that leaves out any of these factors. They work together always, though not always in the same direction. Sometimes they aid and sometimes they hinder or counteract each other. Often false religious beliefs have operated to retard or prevent social progress. This is conspicuously true of ancestor-worship in China. Ancestor worship has produced a cult that treats all social changes, all attempts at improvement in aims or methods as a kind of sacrilege, as indicating disrespect for the objects of worship. Something of the same influence long prevailed in Japan, keeping it back from social progress it was well fitted in many respects to make. Not until American ideas were introduced among the people did she wake up to the possibilities that lay before her and begin a rapid economic development.

Even in Christendom itself we may trace the different effects on social progress of differing religious beliefs. Wherever belief in the rightful authority of the church and the priesthood has held sway over the people, social progress has been retarded. Where the people have held to the right of private judgment and individual responsibility, their ethical and economic advances have been immeasurably greater. In other words, in the degree in which religion has been ethical it has also been favorable to progress. Unfortunately, all branches of the church have been heavily handicapped with unethical and obstructive dogmas.

No church holding to the commonly received or orthodox system, whether Catholic or Protestant, has dared to encourage freedom of thought and honesty in speech. All have been hampered in their thinking either by the authority of the church or of the book, and so the ethical side of religion has had scant development. Over and over again in the course of Christian history this ethical side of religion has been brought to the front by communities of people considerable in numbers, and in every case it has revealed a distinctly economic and progressive tendency. It has sought to substitute the co-operative for the competitive spirit; to organize men for mutual service, and for the express purpose of bringing the Kingdom of Heaven, or the reign of love, here upon earth. But its dogmatic departure from the standards of faith and its social heresies brought down upon it the anathemas of the church and the armies of the State, and so an economic system has been developed in harmony with the creeds, but at variance with every ethical principle of every religion.

But this ethical element is again to the front. It is demanding social changes more radical and far-reaching than any contem-

plated by the heretics of the past, and all who are urging these changes are urging them on grounds of justice and equity, of humanity and brotherhood. Of course, they are changes in the interest of a true economy, and are urged on this ground, but they are more than this, and the chief consideration named by their advocates are the moral and spiritual advantages which will accrue to all concerned.

True, indeed, the economic development which has taken place in the last few years has not been affected by ethical ideas, nor is it at heart an ethical development. It is ethical, as moving on the lines of economic law, but unethical as to the purpose and spirit of the men who are chiefly instrumental in bringing it about, and in the distribution of the benefits derived. The demand now growing and voicing itself is that it be made ethical in its character,—that it be so widened in its scope as to embrace in its benefits the whole body politic.

The vital question at issue is whether economic forces alone are adequate to the work of effecting this change. Here we come to the dividing line between the strictly economic view of society and the position we hold. Our writer says "the idealistic position holds that ideas move society. A man may conceive a good thing and then persuade men to adopt it. In other words, as our writer has said: "Beautiful schemes may be thought out and then applied to society from without by propaganda." All this our writer repudiates. Ideas have nothing to do with social growth. They are effects, not causes, and effects which in her philosophy cannot become causes.

And yet, she took the trouble to write this article to help people to clear thinking on this subject. If clear thinking has no relation to rational economic action, one cannot but wonder to what end she put herself to this trouble. I can understand the Presbyterian with his doctrine of pre-destination. When the son, who was being punished by his Presbyterian father for some act of disobedience, demurred to the punishment on the ground that he was pre-destined to do it and could not therefore refrain, the father replied that he also was pre-destined to give him the trouncing, and was equally blameless in the matter. There is some show of logic in this, but I can see no consistency whatever in writing an article full of ideas for the one and only purpose of proving that ideas have nothing whatever to do in shaping human action. The palpable absurdity of the thing makes one stop and re-examine the statements of the writer lest I do her an injustice, but if her language has any definite meaning, I am certainly guilty of no misrepresentation. Suppose it be true, as she affirms,—and I believe it is—that "industrial life—the way in which men get their living—is dominant and that, as reason-

ing beings, we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions.” Suppose these conditions are fundamental—that the bread and butter considerations, generally speaking, outweighs all others. It does not at all follow that the people pressed by these conditions are led by this pressure to the best possible means of bettering their condition.

The chief causes of distress and poverty may lie in their ignorance or their indolence,—their want of energy and thrift—their lack of ideas and ideals. Let a man like Bishop Fenelon come among such a people, wise, active, energetic, full of kindness and brotherly interest, winning their confidence and regard, inspiring them with something of his own purpose and spirit, teaching them, guiding them, developing in them habits of industry, economy, sobriety, thrift, in a few years the whole character of that community will be changed. They will be living in comparative comfort. Their homes will be clean, their children will be well clad, and at school, and the people generally industrious, sober and thrifty.

Are we to seek the causes of such a change only in the material conditions of their existence? Have ideas, ethics, religion, nothing to do with their social progress? Material conditions of existence alone do not effect changes of this kind. Wherever they take place you will find other and higher forces at work aiming directly at this end.

No matter if all we know of ethics and religions has come to us through the processes of evolution, and largely through contact on the economic plane, such knowledge is not void of power because thus evolved, and there is no stage of human history in which ethics and religion do not enter as factors in the social evolution. Often they are the chief and determining factors.

The movement on the part of the American people which resulted in Free Cuba, and in several other things which they did not contemplate, was undoubtedly due to considerations of humanity, and in no degree prompted by the hope of economic benefits. And while the final issue may be regarded as the natural outcome of Cuba's struggle for better material conditions, it is safe to say that American rule in the island has done more for social progress in Cuba during the brief period of its continuance than Cuba herself would have wrought out unaided in half a century. The sanitary and other reforms wrought in the large cities of the island and now in good measure adopted and supported by the Cuban people were due to American ideas and American ethics, not at all overindulged in at home.

How far the American people have been influenced by re-

gard for the future of the Filipinos in supporting the policy of the government in extending American rule over their islands it is difficult to say. Certainly they have not been influenced by any considerations of material profit realizable in their lifetime. How far national pride and other less worthy considerations have moved them we can only guess. But of one thing we may rest assured, unless the American people hold their government to a high standard in its administration of Philippine affairs and insist that American rule be conducted in a way and with a view to fit those people for home rule, our new relations with the Filipinos will not contribute to our own social progress. This does not imply that we are under any obligations to set the interests of these people above our own interests on any plane, but that we should deal with them justly, ethically, and cultivate in them the qualities that give strength and worthy character to a nation.

Deficient as our people may be in the matter of ethics, they are much farther advanced than they are in economics. They know very well the attitude they ought to sustain in their dealings with their fellows, but they have no conception whatever of any social or industrial system making practicable the justice they feel ought to exist. Economic conditions press hardly on multitudes of people, but throw no light for them on the problems they need to have solved. They need light and light that does not come from the prison. They need ideas, but ideas are not always born amid conditions of ignorance, poverty and distress.

It may be true that every great economic change has brought a corresponding change in ethical codes. But individual ethical teaching may have played a large part in effecting the economic change which made possible the better code. There has been no period of human history for many thousand years in which the standard of right as held by the wisest and best of every nation has not been far in advance of the most progressive society in existence. And the growth all along the line has been toward this standard. The conviction that men should love their neighbors as they love themselves was never formulated by any Congress or Parliament as the result of a nation's economic experience. It was formulated in the mind of a seer,—one who had a deep knowledge of human nature and a profound insight into human relations. In all ages of the world this thought has been voiced in one form or another by the wise and the good, and no economic improvement has ever taken place that has not in some measure been quickened and guided by this or some kindred thought.

The real truth that we need to realize is that we can never

hope to bring society to this level through any religious or ethical teaching which does not demand and effect such economic changes as justice and equity require. Religious and ethical teaching will both prove practically abortive so long as they are shut out from the realm of economics. The church since the days of Constantine has never sought to enter that realm. Business has been one thing and religion another, and ethics it has always regarded as nothing but a form of paganism.

Hence, it is not strange that students of history have everywhere found in governments, literature, ethics and education the predominating influence of the economic conditions of the time and place at which they were evolving. Of course they have. The level of a people's government, literature, education and ethical practice can never rise much above the level of its industrial life.

The real character of people is found in those activities into which they put the greater part of their thought, their time, their energy. But if we wait for economic developments to give us worthier conceptions of God and duty—if we drop all talk about justice and brotherhood and neighborly obligation and wait for the movement of economic forces to bring us into juster and happier relations, under the impression that ideas play no part in social development, we will have a long wait of it.

No, truth is the great reformer. But we want to insist on its visible expression and embodiment in all our laws and institutions. It is not a thing to be talked only. It is a reality to be lived, to be wrought into every product of our daily activity, and to enter into every relation we sustain. When the ethical and religious teachers of the world shall take this attitude and seek for truth as they dig for hidden treasures, then social progress will show another pace. The Republic of God will come, and his will will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Rev. Alexander Kent,
Peoples' Church.

Washington, D. C., April 5, 1903.

A Reply to Professor Seligman.

I. Socialism and the Materialistic Conception of History.

PROFESSOR SELIGMAN of Columbia University deserves the thanks of all students of economics and the philosophy of history from the fact that he is the first American scholar who has been bold enough to project into the realm of discussion the historical philosophical concepts of Marx and the Socialist school.

This he has done in a recently published work entitled "The Economic Interpretation of History," which title is a modernized and Americanized rendering of our old familiar "materialistic conception."

Little fault is to be found with the change of title, except perhaps, that it is slightly unnecessary, and, that as the book is really an examination of the theories of Marx and Engels in respect of the philosophy of history, it might have been more advisable to retain the name which they themselves had given to their ideas. But any objection of this sort is but carping criticism, particularly in view of the painstaking and, for the most part, fair and judicious way in which the task has been accomplished. It is a gain of no little importance to have the matter fairly stated, and will open the way to a frank discussion of the relations of economic and other phenomena which have been too much overlooked by the students of English-speaking countries. If it accomplishes nothing else it must tend to a modification of that, for want of a better term, "high-falutin'" view which is so generally adopted, and that perniciously virtuous parochialism which is the distinguishing quality of most American university works in this department of study.

If a decent appreciation of the value of the economic factor in history even as stated in this little work had been taught twenty years ago, Bryanism would never have lifted its noisy voice, and it would not take the twenty years, which would now appear to be necessary, to inform the graduates of our colleges that the political contest pending is one between the trusts and the proletariat for the possession of the means of production.

So that students, as well as Socialists, have every reason to thank Professor Seligman for the beginning which he has made.

It now remains to the Socialist to traverse the statements of the learned professor and to discover wherein they are not such as can be accepted offhand and, particularly, as regards the alleged want of connection between Socialism and the "economic interpretation" of history. Upon this point Professor Seligman is very strong. He says:

"There is nothing in common between the economic interpretation of history and the doctrine of Socialism except the accidental fact that the originator of both theories happened to be the same man. Karl Marx founded "scientific Socialism," and by that curious term he means his theory of surplus value and the conclusions therefrom. Karl Marx also recognized the economic interpretation of history and thought that his own version of this interpretation would prove to be a bulwark of his socialist theory (page 105).

This is rather a questionable method of approaching the matter. "The accidental fact" that the man, with whose name modern Socialism is more closely connected than with that of any other person, held to both theories and found them not only not mutually exclusive, but very closely connected, should have led to a closer examination of the reasons why Marx regarded them as mutually dependent. But so far from giving this matter the necessary amount of thought Professor Seligman blunders into an almost inexcusable error.

He defines "scientific Socialism" as "the theory of surplus-value and the conclusions therefrom." Such a definition does not meet the case and our author appears to be himself aware of the fact, for the qualifying clause, "if by that curious phrase he means," is a rather disingenuous method of saddling Marx with a definition of the term to which he would never have acceded. "Scientific Socialism"—and the clumsiness of the term is fully conceded—includes the materialistic conception and the theory of surplus value, and of these the former is the more important, so much the more, indeed, that the latter, as will appear, may be eliminated from the definition without impairing it as a statement of Socialist doctrine.

In fact so far from the materialistic conception of history serving as a "bulwark" of the surplus-value theory, the latter has been generally supposed by those who have controverted it to have originated in the desire of Marx to provide an economic auxiliary for agitation of the proletariat by proclamation of the class war, which class war is deduced by Marx from his observations of political and economic history and upon which both he and Engels laid the greatest possible stress. Thus Engels says: "In modern history at least it is therefore proved that all political conflicts are class conflicts, and all fights of classes for emancipation . . . finally turn on economic emancipation" (Feuerbach 2nd. ed. p. 48. Dietz).

That such a view of the relation of the two theories is not farfetched nor made for purely controversial purposes will be the more evident when it is understood that non-Socialist writers have seen this relation from the same standpoint, as is here

taken and which is, in fact, the only one from which the development of the Socialist movement can be examined with any chance of comprehensibility. Thus in his "Western Civilization" Benjamin Kidd says:

"Marxian Socialism is not merely or even chiefly an economic theory, but rather a complete self-contained philosophy of human life and society" (p. 130).

Now such "philosophy of human life and society" as Marx holds is founded, without question, on the economic interpretation of history, and, hence, it is upon this that Socialism in the last analysis depends and not at all upon the theory of surplus value, the truth or falsity of which is not here in the least under consideration. Thus the discrediting of the surplus-value theory cannot be taken as discrediting Socialism, even Marxian Socialism, and any attempt to drag the "surplus-value" theory into the discussion is simply to befog the issue which the professor has raised between "scientific Socialism" and the "economic interpretation."

Our contention on this point derives additional force from the statements of non-Socialists and those who have no interest in defending the movement. Thus in Kirkup's well-known "History of Socialism" we find "There can be no doubt that in his theory of surplus value obtained from unpaid labor, Marx, as agitator and controversialist, has fallen into serious contradiction with himself, as scientific historian and philosopher. . . . His doctrine of surplus value is the vitiating factor in his history of the capitalist system. The most obvious excuse for him is that he borrowed it from the classical economists" ("A History of Socialism." Kirkup, pp. 146-7. Black, Lond. 1892). And as evidence of the relative value of the two theories according to Kirkup we find:

"The cardinal point in the theory worked out by Marx and now impressed upon the League (The League of the Just) was the doctrine that THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS CONTROL THE ENTIRE SOCIAL structure, therefore the main thing is a social revolution, a change in economic conditions" (id. p. 159).

It appears therefore that even if we give up the whole case for surplus value and fall prostrate at the feet of Professor Böhm-Bawerk, "scientific Socialism" is still by no means posed of, and that the main conception which is manifested in the Social Democratic movement and which furnishes that movement with a consistent philosophy and with keen political insight, is nothing other than the materialistic conception, of which our author says in its relation to Socialism: "It is plain that the two things have nothing to do with each other" (p. 106).

But Professor Seligman himself unconsciously admits the whole case against his contention. He says: "The Neo-Marxists themselves such as Bernstein, for instance, disagree with Marx's views as to the immediate future of the class struggle, and consider that his doctrine of the 'impending cataclysm of capitalist society' has been disposed of by the facts of the half century which has intervened since the theory was propounded. Yet Bernstein would not for a moment abandon his belief in the economic interpretation of history as we have described it" (p. 107). In support of this statement is quoted as follows from Bernstein's "Zur Geschichte und Theorie des Sozialismus" "realistische Geschichtsbetrachtung die in ihren Hauptzügen unwiderlegt geblieben ist."

Says Professor Seligman, in effect: "Bernstein has abandoned the extreme Marxist position, but retains his faith in economic interpretation, but Bernstein is a Socialist, therefore there is no connection between the economic interpretation and Socialism." The "merry gods" must laugh to see our Vulcan limp so lamely at the board.

But this is a trifle compared with what the learned professor can do when he gets really warmed up to the work. He goes on: "In fact, the Socialist application of the economic interpretation of history is exceedingly naive. If history teaches anything at all it is that economic changes transform society by slow and gradual steps." Then he proceeds to show how slowly society has developed and incidentally makes the following remarkable assertion: "The characteristic mark of the modern factory system, still in its infancy, is the predominance of the individual or corporate entrepreneur on a huge scale, as we see it typified in the present trust movement in America" (p. 107). This is in support of the stability of private property, when we are all well aware that the result of the trust movement is to place individual control of property at a greater disadvantage than hitherto, and that the creation of huge joint-stock affairs menaces with annihilation the "private property" of the small investors.

This, merely by the way; but since when did Professor Seligman learn that the modern Socialist is wedded to a catastrophic doctrine or that it is a fundamental theory of "scientific Socialism" that "private property and private initiative . . . will at once give way to the collective ownership, which forms the ideal of the Socialists?" To be a Marxist is not to see visions and dream dreams. Suppose that Marx did expect an earlier development of the collectivist movement than has been the case, such an idea with regard to the realization of their propaganda is not unusual with propagandists, and in fact some

such faith is necessary to send men on missionary enterprises, but it is by no means binding on their successors. Christianity would shrink to small proportions nowadays if it were proposed to limit the term Christian to those who believed in and looked for the second advent of Christ, though there can hardly be a shadow of doubt that the early Christians did devoutly so believe and based their actions on such belief. Succeeding generations have moderated their expectations, so with the Socialists.

No better evidence of this can be shown than the preamble to the famous resolution introduced by Karl Kautsky to the Socialist International Congress held in Paris in 1900, and which has been the subject of much heated discussion in the Socialist sections. It will be noticed in this connection that the Kautsky resolution cannot be attributed to individual opinion, for there is no doubt that it represents substantially the general opinion of organized Socialists, as the vote by nationalities in the Congress stood twenty-nine for and nine against the resolution.

This preamble is as follows: "In a modern democratic state the conquest of the public powers by the proletariat cannot be the result of a coup de main, it must be the result of a long and painful work of proletarian organization on the economic and political fields, of the physical and moral regeneracy of the laboring class and of the gradual conquest of municipalities and legislative assemblies."

There is no touch of "impending cataclysm" in this and this represents the sentiment of sober Socialist thought at the present time. Kautsky is a Marxist, not a neo-Marxist, he still maintains the surplus-value theory, and in spite of that cannot be accused of any catastrophic tendencies. But the learned professor may thereupon reply that he is not a Marxist proper. That sort of retort, which is far too common, will not do, however. The attitude adopted by Professor Seligman towards modern Socialism is very suggestive of a freethinker who reads the Bible in order to confute Christianity. After a close study of the sacred writing he arrives at the conclusion that Particular Methodism is the religion which Christ instituted and which therefore the Church follows. He thereupon directs his entire argument upon Particular Methodism and withers it with beautiful scorn. Soon, however, he runs across a Christian who objects to his diatribes upon the ground that they are directed against Particular Methodism, and that he is not a Particular Methodist. To which the freethinker triumphantly and conclusively replies: "You are a believer in the Bible, therefore you must be a Particular Methodist." This conclusion may be eminently satisfactory to the freethinker, but it will be ob-

served that it does not even make a Particular Methodist of his adversary, and still less does it point out to that adversary wherein he is wrong.

The argument of Professor Seligman will not bear examination. It rests on a foundation which is not only flimsy but is inherently false, for the definitions of 'scientific Socialism' upon which he predicates its differentiation from the economic interpretation have been shown to be insufficient and misleading. It is almost inconceivable how he could have so misunderstood the significance of the Socialist propaganda. He could hardly have read a Socialist paper of standing in any language without being convinced that the whole propaganda is based upon the economic interpretation of history and not upon any particular economic doctrine or ethical scheme of reform. The very case of Bernstein is in point. He is in good standing in the Social Democratic Party, he does not suffer in Socialist estimation as a popular politician, and all the academic disputes which occur with regard to his modifications of the strict Marxian doctrine are to be regarded not as fundamentally affecting his standing as a Socialist, but simply as illustrating a certain growth or deterioration, according to the personal point of view, from the strict Marxian doctrine. They serve rather to show the independence of the movement and its freedom from "doctrinaire"-ism, or catastrophic teaching.

Its practical politics are proof of exactly the same thing. If Socialism represented merely a catastrophic notion or an abiding faith in the bare theory of surplus value, we should find the party abetting all schemes of attack upon the proprietary class. But this is not the case. We find, on the other hand, the greatest possible caution on the part of the leaders of the movement, and a very marked desire not to interfere with the free play of economic forces, except as far as concerns the economic condition of the workers. Australian or empiric Socialism which aims at interference with the accumulation of capital is not regarded with favor by the real exponent of modern Socialism and attacks upon the trusts are left to our strenuous President and the Democratic party.

But the learned professor is not content even with what he has done to differentiate Socialism and the economic interpretation. He says: "Socialism is a theory of what ought to be, historic materialism is a theory of what has been, the one is teleological, the other is descriptive. The one is a speculative ideal, the other is a canon of interpretation" (p. 108).

He is no more fortunate here than formerly. Socialism, modern Socialism, the Socialism of Marx and Engels is by no means a theory of what ought to be though the term might be applied

with sufficient truth to the famous schemes of pre-Marxian Socialists against whose glowing visions Marx launches the strongest invective.

Now if Professor Seligman means to imply that modern Socialism is the promulgation of "the Kingdom of Heaven at hand" idea, the setting forth of a millennium, then he can only find support in the platform utterances of perfervid enthusiasts whose oratory is not to be taken as typical of the teaching of modern Socialism. Such a source is not authoritative and Professor Seligman would certainly not employ it for controversial purposes. Still he is possessed with this notion, and repeats oracularly that the one is "teleological." Who, after reading the works of Engels, could associate the word teleology with the party which is the avowed advocate of the views expressed in that word? To accuse the works of Engels of being "teleological" in their teachings is the very height of—shall we say pedagogical—assumption? By whom has the dialectic mode of thought and conception of the universe been more clearly enunciated than by Engels?

Socialism on its active side is the practical recognition of the truth of the economic interpretation and the class-struggle, Socialism as an objective ultimate, and even so the term is loosely employed, is merely the victory of the proletariat in the class-struggle—nothing more and nothing less—that is if we are to accept the teachings of its recognized exponents, rather than be misled by the clamor of the unauthorized speaker and pamphleteer.

How would an exponent of Republican ideas like to have the views of Mr. Blodgett, candidate for the office of Coroner in the well-known district of Slaughter's Gulch, held out as representative? Professor Seligman's definition of Socialism is objectionable on every ground and cannot be accepted as a basis of argument.

Neither is the definition of the economic interpretation any more satisfactory, but the occasion for an examination of that will arise later. It is sufficient to say for the present that the statement, "there is nothing in common between the economic interpretation of history and the doctrine of Socialism," has not been established and that the definitions of Socialism which have been given in support of that statement are misleading and not in accordance with the actual facts.

Austin Lewis.

Restricted Interpretation.

IN a former communication to this journal the writer threw a paper wad in the direction of the recognized orthodox teachers of scientific Socialism, under the caption, "The Dogma of a Cause World." For several reasons the critic was made quite brief, and confined to purely philosophical grounds. On reflection I conclude that if one is to assume the role of a critic at all, he should make the application of his remarks quite plain, so that, right or wrong, the matter may be looked into. He should also, if possible, himself point out the necessary amendment.

Let me pause here to speak a word in my own defense. I am anxious that the reader should understand at once that I am a Socialist myself, a fighter for economic justice, and not just simply a fault finder with the weapons with which others fight. At least, the writer of these remarks has never voted any other than a Socialist ticket, and the matter of that, small as it is, he feels to be a better passport than assuming the role of critic.

In the article above mentioned I laid at the door of the teachers of Socialism a breach of the logical sequence of cause and effect in the matter of assuming what I called a "cause world." Let me define what I mean by a "cause world" as the assumption of a solitary, omnipotent cause as the source of all phenomena or effects; which, of course, implies as its necessary corollary the denying to all the other facts their rightful heritage in philosophy, the potency and necessity of being causes. This criticism is aimed at the doctrine of economic determinism as it is taught, though I observe that it does not apply to any of the definitions of that principle that I have yet seen. None of the definitions—per se—assume, or imply a solitary cause, nor set apart a class of causes as being the only ones that apply. The definitions simply name a cause as being the principal, or most fundamental one. Here is the definition by Professor Seligman, which the editor of this magazine tells us in the best worded one yet: "The existence of man depends upon his ability to sustain himself; the economic life is therefore the fundamental condition of all life." Let me repeat that I find nothing to criticize in this. Nevertheless, I do find much to complain of in the way it is being interpreted and taught.

Let us remark here that the position of one who takes a positive stand for any system of teaching and "stands for it," is a far more arduous and important one than that of the irresponsible critic—the mere bushwhacker in the thicket. Yet the one

is no more under obligation, in the first place, to give us a faultless philosophy than the other.

The writer is enabled to make the concrete application of his philosophical quibble by the appearance in the March number of the REVIEW of a most lucid presentation of the doctrine as it is understood and taught by Socialists in this country, from the pen of one of our ablest teachers. I have insinuated that the doctrine as taught is philosophically unsound. "Now there it is for you; what is the matter with it, pray?" Just only this—the difference in the meaning of the words "principal" and "only" as applied to causes. A very small matter, apparently, when thus simply stated, but a mighty difference indeed when elaborated into a philosophy of human life and history! Now let us proceed to make carpet rags of the thing, seriatim, being careful to note points of agreement as well as difference.

We can begin our agreement with the first sentence of the article now under review, "The Economic Interpretation of History," viz.: "The standpoint from which one approaches the study of society or history, is of the first importance." We might continue to agree but that in the next sentence: "All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress"—I would change "cause" to "causes," making it plural. And why? Because I deny that effects all flow from some one "Great First Cause"—albeit a material one. All science, and all sound philosophy, I maintain, recognize the interaction of all the contingent causes. Our conception of the process of social growth, to be truly scientific, must be founded in a just estimate of the balance struck by all the contributing causes, and not upon this theological notion of an all-sufficient cause of things, to which all else must stand as mere effects.

What is it that we want? We want a philosophy of human life and history that is sound—i. e., well established in the principles of that philosophy of the actual called science. This notion of a first, or all-sufficient, cause is not one of the principles of scientific thought. The conception of results as arising from the combined influence of all the contingent causes is the scientific thought. That the conception of social growth has arisen to its present status let us rejoice. But a science of society not grounded in the continuity of cause and effect, and a just estimate of the several influences that interact in producing effects, is a "black sheep" among the sciences. But let us proceed with the review.

Our teacher proceeds to tell us in an admirable way, how the all-sufficient cause of things sociological was first sought in the "great man theory," and easily disposes of the "great man" as a great first cause. "Society, then, is not advanced to higher

... about what we do certainly know, but an ultimate, first

cause we do not yet know. At least, not by the method of science. Science knows many causes, but not "the" cause.

"These three lines include practically all the important attempts to explain social growth from the idealists' standpoint." I would though, on my own account, add to these yet a fourth important line of human development, idealistic or not, viz.: the progressive softening and melting out of human nature of the savage and brutal, and the corresponding ripening of the truly human or humane. As examples in point I would mention the growing aversion to war; the discontinuance of the practice of duelling, or its amelioration to a harmless farce, and the falling off of the habit of resorting to fisticuffs on the slightest provocation, notwithstanding that our sporty "betters" are cultivating pugilism as the manly art. Seen also in the mitigation of scolding wives, and the cultivation of tolerable manners by most people.

With the history of the rise of the idea of social solidarity and growth given by our comrade I am well pleased and heartily concur as to its paramount importance. I would only aid, by applying to it the severest criticism (which is an indispensable part of the scientific method) in perfecting it into a sound and unassailable science. This restricted interpretation must go! The "cause world" must go! Finally we come to Marx. "His proposition was 'that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch.' "

Here the Socialist shouts Eureka! Behold, we have, indeed, at last found it. Found what—the Eldorado? No; but the Cause World—the solitary, omnipotent cause of all things. Behold, the secret of all things is just in this—the way that the human animal browses is the sole and only cause of the way it builds its nest, the way it tunes its lay, the way it gambols upon the green and the way it contemplates the starry sky. Will the human mind ever grow capacious enough to entertain more than one idea at a time? Sometime, perhaps, we shall have assorted all the useless from the useful in the results of our age-long religious training. Evidently the theological thought dies hard.

"Industrial life, the way in which men get their living is dominant, and as reasoning beings we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions." Well and good. "Throughout all the superstructures that have grown upon this foundation—governments, literature, ethics and education—there may be traced the predominating influence of

the economic conditions of the time and place in which they were evolving." This, however, does not prevent the tracing of the other influences; as, for instance, of religion in literature, music, ethics, education, etc.; of education in all the others, even the economic; of forceful and active individuals—great men—in the political and industrial movements, in fact in all departments of human activity. The crutches of a cripple may be said to be the "principal conditioning factor" of his locomotion. Whatever impulses he may have he can hardly move without them. Still one would not say that the crutches were the sole cause of his progress, once he gets them and gets off.

All this, of course, does not inveigh against the philosophy that apples are not plucked until they are ripe. But to this again I could rejoin that apples, however obviously ripe for the plucking, may rot upon the trees if the expected pluckers prove too stupid or timid to get their feet off the ground. In point of fact, the practical question seems to resolve itself into the question not of who should but of who will dare shake the trees. This matter, however, is not necessarily involved. Let us to the point.

It appears to be a fault of the teachers of Socialism to say one thing and mean another in this matter of the economic interpretation. At least, they give one to understand quite another thing from what is implied in the definitions of the principle itself, and the plain logic of the interpretation is constantly leading to awkward attitudes. We could aptly call the restricted interpretation of the principle the "martingale" of our Socialist harness, since it is only an awkward way of holding the head.

For instance: "The industrial interests of the North caused the Civil War. It was fought for the purpose of making free labor cheaper than slave labor." It is a perfectly logical inference from this that ardent abolitionists like Garrison, Lovejoy and Harriet Beecher Stowe were in no wise inspired by the same spirit of liberty and humanity as the Socialists to-day, but were conscious conspirators on behalf of the capitalists. This, notwithstanding the abolition agitation was not the sole immediate cause of the war. These desired the freedom of the blacks. The war gave them that freedom. Free competition of labor makes it cheaper to the capitalists than chattel slaves. But let us take a parallel case. The invention of labor-saving machinery has the same effect, it makes labor cheaper (more profitable) to the capitalists. Now if we accept this restricted interpretation and assume that because "the economic life is the fundamental condition of all life," therefore the material selfish interest is the only motive cause of human action, we not only renounce the whole moral nature of man, but make of the loftiest impulses

the basest of treachery, and of the most useful activities, such as invention, to be crimes against humanity simply because under this misfit economic system the ultimately result in evil. If we are to renounce as inherently evil all that is perverted to evil under this vicious system, and as worthless or impotent all the better part of human nature, which is repressed by the unfavorable environment, what shall we have left to cling to at all—not even our own souls! Though this logical sequence is not, since lately, insisted upon by Socialists, and the reasoning pushed to its *reductio ad absurdum*, it yet remains a logical sequence from an illogical interpretation.

Once more: “So we find that the economic conditions impress themselves on the literature, the government and the forms of education that exist in any period.” Quite true; and yet these Socialist agitators seem to be laboring under the delusion (?) that literature, government, education, etc., will, on the other hand, impress themselves upon the economic conditions to the extent of working an entire social revolution. Let us hope they are right about that.

In conclusion, let me ask whether it is not probable that when the bread and butter question is settled, as we Socialists say, the economic factor—“the bread and butter question”—will have lost its supremacy as being even the “principal” determining factor. May we not hope that ethics, for instance, will have risen in influence to a sufficient extent to at least hold its own with the economic—though still, of course, “conditioned” by it—so as to maintain this thing we are struggling for, economic justice? In fact, may we not hope that this simply material “conditioning factor” will be held in control by the more distinctively human factors, with the result that they will no longer be “dominated,” perverted and overridden by it as they now admittedly are? We hope so, of course. And if we are right in these, our expectations, then it would appear that if we cling to this restricted interpretation, and confine our philosophy of life within its narrow bounds, we would on “the day after the social revolution” find ourselves with a philosophy of life on our hands that would be not alone illogical and imperfect as it now certainly is, but entirely inapplicable then.

Z. C. Ferris.

A Correction.

I HERE is an old saying "that figures won't lie, but liars will figure." This may be a little too severe to apply to the election returns quoted by John Murray, Jr., in his article in the January number. I send you authentic figures and you can judge for yourself.

I will admit that it is perfectly justifiable to quote facts in support of any argument, but I hold it to be unworthy of a Socialist to distort the truth or misrepresent facts to bolster up a cause.

If Comrade Murray had been desirous of making an honest comparison of the vote cast in different years, he might have chosen the highest vote cast, or the lowest vote cast, or the average vote cast, and nobody could have criticised his action. But to compare the highest vote cast in one election with the lowest vote cast at an ensuing election, and with the lowest vote cast in a subdivision only of the district at a third election is most certainly a contemptible method of juggling.

Election of 1898—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket	1,298
Lowest School Director	2,205
Highest School Director	4,331

Election of 1901—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket	915
Highest candidate	1,457

Election of 1902—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket	1,977
----------------------	-------

Congressional, 4th	616
Congressional, 5th	408

Congressional vote in San Francisco	1,024
Highest Socialist candidate	2,681

If Comrade Murray wishes the truth to be known he can say the vote fell off from 4,331 in 1898 to 2,681 in 1902. Or, he can say the vote fell off from 1,298 in the year 1898 to 1,024 in the last election.

But I submit that to claim the vote fell from "our four thousand" to "but 616," is false. All this is entirely apart from the merits of the question discussed in Comrade Murray's article. It refers merely to facts misstated.

Oliver Everett.

Reply to Comrade Everett.

OLIVER EVERETT'S letter, criticising certain figures in my article in the January number of your Review, was forwarded to me at this place. His statement that the total vote cast for Congressman in San Francisco at the last election was 1,024 (and not 616, as I believed and stated) is correct. Thus far his letter is in good part, but let us consider the balance: In the first place my contention that the Socialist vote in San Francisco suffered an enormous falling off every time it fought the Union Labor party is as much borne out by his figures as mine. For instance, he says that the head of the ticket in 1898 polled 1,298 votes (no opposing candidate of the U. L. P. in 1898) and but 915 votes in 1901 (Socialists fought the U. L. P. in 1901), while in 1902 the "head of the ticket" received 1,977 votes. This would appear to show a gain in 1902, but is it? Here is the joker: In 1902 the "head of the ticket" had no opposing U. L. P. candidate—the trades unions had no State ticket in the field, and the Socialists had nominated a well-known trades unionist for Governor, who had received the official endorsement of the U. L. P. in Los Angeles. This candidate, Mr. Brower, had not only received the official endorsement of the U. L. P. in Los Angeles, but was also well and favorably known as a staunch trades unionist and as being strongly in favor of the policy in question. No wonder that the Socialist-trades unionist "head of the ticket" in 1902 received an increase of 1,000 votes over the anti-trades unionist "head of the ticket" in 1901. But see what the candidate in the same district received who fought the U. L. P. candidate at the last election—1,024 votes! Here we have a difference of almost 100 per cent between the Socialist candidate who stood for organized labor and the Socialist candidate who opposed it. But the figures speak for themselves,—I am perfectly willing to rest my case on Oliver Everett's figures—especially since many of Mr. Everett's faith insist that the votes cast for Costle (1,024) represents the Socialist vote of San Francisco.

One other matter in Everett's letter I must speak of,—for in several portions he practically calls me a liar. A lie must be intentional. Now is it probable that I would seek to falsify public records so carefully studied by the San Francisco comrades as the last election returns? The truth is that I had been informed that the Fourth Congressional District practically covers San Francisco, and in this I was wrong. In the past, neither

Oliver Everett, nor any other Socialist, has ever accused me of lying, and a fair critic would have first tried to ascertain whether or no I was merely ignorant of a fact rather than to rush hastily into personal vilification.

John Murray, Jr.

To an Eminent Divine.

In Gratefulness, Not So Much for What He Has Done, as That Which He Has Refrained From Doing.



WHO have looked to you for light,
To teach me the way and the Truth,
And to keep my feet in the rugged path
While life was yet in its youth:

I who have knelt at the foot of the Cross
With my head bent down in prayer,
While my soul, as a bark on the angry waves,
Was tossing—I knew not where!

I am weary of living if life be naught
But this damnable reign of Hell,
And my soul is weary with grief and strife
Which nothing but Truth can quell.

But you, in this hour of trying need,
Have dropped her torch from your hold;
When the hour draws near for man's brotherhood
You barter your priesthood for gold.

Now the time is passed when we look for Light
To be fanned from a creed's dead coal;
But her beacon light must be kindled bright
From the spark in each man's soul.

And forth from this night-time of greed and shame
There shall issue a perfect day;
And the despot Might yield his scepter to Right,
Who shall rule in Love's Kingdom for aye.

Graff Clarke.

Special Organizing Fund.

Omaha, Neb., April 10, 1903.



O the Members of the Socialist Party..

Comrades—A great opportunity confronts the Socialists of this country. The rapidly growing sentiment for Socialism, the working class tendency towards independent political action, the increasing number of industrial conflicts and strikes, the futility of Civic Federations and Arbitration Commissions to avert these conflicts and produce harmony between the antagonistic forces represented by the working class and the capitalist class, the promulgation of decoy labor parties, the deterioration and breakup of the Democratic party, the abject failure of the Republican party to handle the trust question, and the open activity of the capitalist class in its opposition to Socialism; all these and hundreds of other evidences, apparent on every side, should teach us that the time has come when Socialists must prepare for the final struggle between Socialism and Capitalism.

For years we have been sowing the seed for the ripening harvest. Socialist papers and literature, agitators and writers, scholars and thinkers have grown in number until they can be found in every city, town and village in North America. Our press extends into every State and territory, and turn which way it will, the capitalist class sees the doom of the present system written in an increased Socialist vote. All this has come to pass after years of work and trial on the part of men and women now living, and of brave souls who have passed away ere the dreams they dreamed came true.

One thing above all others remains for the Socialists to do at this time. The circulation of the entire Socialist press must continue to increase, our lecturers and speakers must continue to attract larger and larger audiences, and the capitalist class must give more and more attention to Socialism; but we must be organized to take full advantage of the agitation, education and publicity that will surely follow. We must co-ordinate our efforts and conserve our energies so that the forces that make for Socialism shall be crystallized at the ballot box in an effective demand for the co-operative commonwealth. It is imperative that the Socialist party be so organized during this year that electoral tickets can be nominated in every state in the Union for the national election of 1904.

To achieve this, the national headquarters must have money with which to work. We are developing plans by which every

state can be covered with organizers, and every Socialist enrolled as a party member. We must enter the national campaign with an organization that will place the Socialist party at least second when the votes are counted. This can be accomplished if the Socialists themselves but choose to will it so.

We therefore call upon you to contribute what you can to a special organizing fund, to be used by the national headquarters for immediate organizing purposes. We cannot have a strong and effective organization unless we have organizers, and we cannot have organizers so long as we are without the necessary funds to ensure their taking the field. While the regular revenue of the national office is growing steadily, yet part of this must go toward relieving the party of its legitimate debts, which have already been unsettled too long. These debts must be cleared as soon as possible, and we have already begun a systematic effort to bring this about.

The special organizing fund will be used to the best advantage of the entire movement. Many states, already organized, need assistance in order to revive delinquent locals, to encourage other locals, now working, and to organize new ones. If we can get the organized states into a condition where a steady revenue is assured the respective state committees and the national committee, the states will be strengthened and provision thereby made for extensive operations in unorganized states. An organizer must be sent through the Southern states, where interest is growing, and where organizations that will provide tours for speakers must be formed. Interstate tours for reliable organizers and speakers will be arranged. We intend to make the national office the headquarters for the best party lecturers, thus ensuring economy in every way, guaranteeing a systematic method of conducting our propaganda, and at the same time enabling this office to fulfill its real mission as the National Agitation Bureau of the Socialist Party.

All this can be achieved in a comparatively short time, Comrades, if you will help do it. We know that the demands upon your meager resources are never ending, but we wish to impress you with the fact that \$1,000 expended for organizing purposes by this office within the next few months will return in increased revenue and membership many times over before the year closes; and we want, and should have, at least that sum by May 1st. We do not wish to go to the expense of issuing subscription lists, but we request that locals get out such lists in their respective localities. There are many sympathizers who will subscribe to our fund if their attention is called to it.

Socialists of America, you must act NOW so that all the Socialist Party can enter the national campaign next year fully

equipped to meet the enemy in the first national struggle between Socialism and Capitalism.

Fraternally yours;

WILLIAM MAILLY,
National Secretary.

Approved:

J. P. ROE,
JOHN M. WORK,
ERNEST UNTERMANN,
GEORGE H. TURNER,
SAMUEL LOVETT,

Local Quorum.

Note.—Contributions will be received direct at this office by the National Secretary or through the various state committees. Acknowledgment will be made in the Socialist press. Prompt action is requested, and remember every penny counts.

EDITORIAL

Call for Organization.

We publish this month, elsewhere, what we believe is one of the most important documents that has ever been issued from the National headquarters of the Socialist Party. It does not discuss great questions of principle, nor does it deal with any of the many controversial points in Socialist doctrine, and yet it may well be of more historical importance than any of those bearing upon these topics. We refer to the call for an Organization Fund which the Local Quorum and National Secretary are sending out.

We have already pointed out in these columns some months ago that the great pressing need of the party at just the present moment is its organization, and the proper parties to take hold of this are the National headquarters, working, of course, in close co-operation with the State authorities in those States already organized. It is something to be regretted that with a voting strength which is approaching close to a half million, there are only about 15,000 dues paying members in the United States. This is of special significance at the beginning of a National campaign.

The work for Socialism that is most effective is done through the party organization. Indeed, it is only through such an organization that the scanty resources which must always be at the disposal of a proletarian party can be utilized to any advantage. Not until the party membership has reached a point where it constitutes a means of reaching simultaneously and effectively every portion of the country, are we really in a position to carry on a political campaign.

There are other reasons which we have pointed out in a previous editorial, which makes organization specially imperative just at this time. There is not the slightest doubt but that the organized forces of capitalists and laborers are lining up for some of the most tremendous battles that ever have been waged. The passing of the new militia bill, the distribution of "riot cartridges," the mapping of the great cities for military purposes, all these point to the fact that capitalism is preparing for, and will welcome, a violent anarchistic outbreak on the part of the laborers. If this is to be prevented and the tremendous energy which is now to be found in the ranks of the dissatisfied laborers who are organized in the economic field be used effectively, it must be through the extension of the organization of the Socialist forces. We must be able to direct this energy into intelligent, fruitful channels. We cannot do this if we are ourselves a

mob. We cannot do it if our organization is confined to a few localities.

Some may think that confining organization to a few great cities means concentration of effort on strategical points, but it really means the reverse. If we are not organized outside of these cities, we will have no forces to concentrate on them when the struggle comes. If, on the other hand, every nook and corner of the country has its Socialist Local we will be able to bring all the resources at our disposal throughout the nation to bear upon any single point should such action become necessary.

There is still another reason for invading the hitherto unorganized territory. Capitalism depends for its support upon the small towns, the rural districts, the economically backward sections of the country, particularly the South. It is from these that it draws the votes in times of peace and the militia in times of labor troubles that can be used to coerce rebellious wage slaves.

In many cases the only information which reaches these places comes through channels completely controlled by the most reactionary portions of capitalism. Even if the organization in such a place is only a very small one it nevertheless gives an opportunity of getting our side of the case before the people when needed, and by virtue of the fact that our appeal is directly in accord with the interests of the people to whom we are speaking, while that of capitalism depends upon deception, we can, even with much smaller resources, counteract the capitalist forces.

It should be easily possible for the Socialists of the United States to raise a fund of several thousand dollars for this purpose, and such a fund will have the power of constantly renewing itself, as every new center of organization will prove a new source of revenue. Not only will it prove such a source directly, but as the Locals grow nearer together geographically, it will make possible local co-operation and an organization of speakers by circuits such as is now being conducted with such remarkable success by the comrades of Michigan.

Should the National headquarters take charge of the organization of such circuits in so far as the general National organization of speakers is concerned, it is probable that a combination of National, State and Local co-operation could be devised that would mean the adequate covering of the entire United States before the close of the campaign of 1904. However, all this is still in the future.

The urgent need at the present time is for money to lay the foundations of this work. If the Socialists of America respond, as they should, to this call the rest will follow as a matter of course. We believe that subscription lists should have accompanied the original call, as the money which is raised in Socialist ranks is almost invariably raised in very small sums and requires the circulation of such lists. This is, however, an occasion in which some of the more wealthy comrades of the party may well come to the front immediately and meet the first expenses necessary to support the work, and by the time these first sums are expended, the smaller sums collected through the party machinery will begin to arrive.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

If the United States Congress has turned down labor at the recent session by pigeon-holing and amending the bills handed in by the trade unionists, the various State Legislatures have done no worse. About everything that organized labor proposed in New York was defeated; in Massachusetts, the Socialists, Carey, MacCartney and Ramsden, did all in their power to force through measures to establish the eight-hour day, better factory inspection, municipal coal yards, to limit child labor, to chip the claws of the injunction-throwing courts, and many other palliations, but the Republican and Democratic members joined hands in a "non-partisan" effort to defeat the three laborites, and they succeeded. In Connecticut nothing was gained, and the politicians went out of their way to attempt to force through a law making it compulsory for unions to incorporate. In Pennsylvania, as soon as a bill went through the House it was strangled in Senate committees. The anti-injunction bill and other important measures were knocked out so rapidly in the upper chamber that a Republican representative, Garner, of Schuylkill, became disgusted and read the riot act. In a sensational speech, he advised taking retaliatory action and the holding up of Senate bills until the labor bills were passed in the upper house. "I want to say to Senators Quay and Penrose, and the machine leaders of the Republican party," he said, "that we have almost come to the parting of the ways. The laboring classes of this State have been fooled for many years. The Republican party has promised to do this, and the Democratic party has promised to do that. Both have lied, and lied in their hearts, when they said it." But his pleadings were in vain. In Indiana the labor press is full of denunciations for the vote-catching solons who had promised the workingmen everything under the sun—until after the ballots were counted. In Nebraska they tell the same story. One of the labor lobbyists at the State capital declared that "so far labor has not been able to hold what it had, let alone to get any more. The thing at Lincoln is rotten." In Utah the labor bills were dumped overboard as quickly as they were introduced or reported, while the bills proposed by the capitalists went through with a rush. In Idaho the unionists held indignation meetings to denounce the politicians for defeating the eight-hour bill and similar measures. In California all the labor papers agree that the labor bills were killed. The unionists made a particularly hard fight to secure the enactment of an anti-injunction law, but the politicians amended the bill in such manner that it is not worth the paper it is printed on. Down in Texas most of the labor measures

were not only defeated or vetoed, but the politicians forced through an anti-trust bill that hits the unions the hardest. Under its provisions union men can be fined, sued and imprisoned, and when labor committees waited upon Bourbon bosses and requested that the law recognizing the legality of unions be re-enacted the politicians dismissed them with the remark that "we are friendly to labor." The Missouri unions announce that nothing was gained; ditto in Georgia, Alabama and other States. In Kansas the organized men are so disappointed that they threaten to start a new party in the near future to fight the old capitalistic parties. The lesson is coming home to the intelligent workers that nothing can be gained by bending the pregnant hinges of the knee to the capitalistic politicians. The only way that they will display respect for workingmen is for the latter to fight them at the ballot-box by supporting the Socialist Party. When they learn that they can no longer use the labor men as what the Germans call "stimmvieh" (voting cattle), they will be willing to make concessions to postpone the deluge.

Not only do the politicians refuse to pass labor bills in the legislative bodies, but where here and there a so-called labor law occasionally gets over the rifle it is only to bump into the judicial rock. For a number of years the unionists of Indiana labored for the enactment of a law providing for a minimum scale of 20 cents an hour for all unskilled labor employed on public works. Now comes the Supreme Court and declares that the law is unconstitutional, and all the time and money spent by organized labor to establish a legal dead line has come to naught. It looks more and more as though labor will be compelled to secede from the old parties and elect class-conscious men from its own ranks to enact and interpret laws.

The window glass blower is the latest mechanic to be wiped out, so far as his skill is concerned. For some months the window glass trust has been experimenting with a blowing machine in Alexandria, Md., with the result that April 18 the window glass plants were closed and 20,000 men, who have the strongest unions in the United States, were told that the services of many were no longer required. In discussing the economic advantages that the trust will now enjoy, Mr. Frank Gessner, the well-known expert in glass manufacturing, says: "Let us take a 54-blower tank, and put the wages of blowers, gatherers and snappers at such a low average rate that no one versed in the art can raise any possible objection. Say there are fifty-four blowers whose wages, single and double strength, average \$40 per week; fifty-four gatherers at \$30 per week, and forty-four snappers at \$10 per week. Anybody interested may figure out the total, which is \$4,220 per week. In the machine equipped factory there are no blowers, gatherers or snappers required, no skilled labor and not a single high priced workman. In the factory at Alexandria, operating four machines, we counted only eight workmen, all told. In comparing the difference between the hand blowing and the machine process, a very well-informed window glass blower allowed eighty common laborers, at \$1.50 each per day, as a full working

force capable of doing the work of fifty-four blowers, fifty-four gatherers and fifty-four snappers. We did not see anything like that number of laborers in or about the works, proportioned to the number of machines in operation; but we are not going to quibble, and will allow eighty common laborers, whose wages at \$1.50 per day would amount to \$720 per week as against the fifty-four gatherers, blowers and snappers, or a weekly saving of \$3,600, and that means a saving of \$14,400 per month, of \$144,000 in a ten months run on a single 54-blower tank furnace plant. When it is stated, therefore, that the cost of producing window glass by the machine process is about one-fifth of what it cost by hand, and that the machine reduces the cost of production fully 80 per cent, it is a very conservative estimate. From the above facts it is evident that hand blowing factories cannot possibly compete with the machine equipped factories, for the very simple reason that if the gatherers, blowers and snappers were to work for \$1.50 each per day; their wages would aggregate \$243 per day against \$120 per day, so that, other things being equal, the manufacturer employing skilled hand labor at \$1.50 per day would be losing \$123 per day on every 54-blower tank employed."

During the past month the annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers was held in New Orleans, and in his annual address, which covers sixty pages, book form, President Parry did not mince words in referring to organized labor. He reiterated his former charges that the unions are lawless institutions and should be destroyed root and branch. He accused the so-called "pure and simple" leaders with attempting to bring about Socialism by forcible methods and differed in this essential with the Socialist Party, which was aiming to accomplish the same end through the ballot-box. Of course, Gompers and other national officers are storming and declare that Parry does not present the real views of the manufacturers, and this opinion is also shared by Mark Hanna and other politicians and their newspapers, who are working overtime to obscure the class struggle. But, all the same, the delegates in New Orleans almost to a man endorsed the sentiments of Parry. They adopted a platform that declares against strikes, boycotts, etc., and favors "open shops" and wage rates and pay days to suit themselves; they endorsed the so-called independent "unions" that are springing up in different parts of the country, declared in favor of "regulating the bad in unions," and patted themselves on the back for defeating the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills in Congress. Finally the manufacturers decided to organize the employing class by trades and federating them on lines similar to those followed by the unions, and for the purpose of resisting the demands of the latter. To clinch matters and to prove that they heartily endorse their president's policy, the convention re-elected Parry unanimously. The trade unionists of the country may as well understand at once that they are going to confront a powerful organization of employers in the future, for the N. A. of M. has experienced wonderful growth during the past year and dozens of organizations in close sympathy with that body have also been formed in different industrial centers which may be merged gradually. It is absurd to be-

little this movement of the capitalists. Nothing can be gained by imitating the ostrich and sticking one's head in the sand. What the unionists should do is give serious consideration to the dangers that confront them by reason of capitalistic unification, put an end to their suicidal jurisdiction controversies, federate more closely all along the line and be prepared for trouble. "In times of peace prepare for war" is advice that holds good as long as the capitalistic system of production remains. And the unions should not neglect to educate the workers to defend their class interests at the ballot-box as well, instead of maintaining an anarchistic passiveness and allowing a small minority of capitalists to run things to suit themselves.

Well, as was predicted in this department some time ago, the British Taff Vale precedent, in which the English railway workers were mulcted out of \$115,000, has found lodgment in American soil. In Rutland, Vt., about 200 machinists went on strike in the F. R. Patch Manufacturing Company nearly a year ago. The company sued for \$10,000 damages, alleged to have been suffered as the result of the strike, and the jury awarded \$2,500. When the suit was brought, over one hundred writs were served on the members of the union. Every piece of available property belonging to any member was attached, and the lawyers say that the Patch Company can recover the judgment from this property. That this case was more important than the mere sum involved is proven by the comments of the daily press and the legal fraternity generally. There are several more damage suits pending, and probably before *The Review* is printed they will be decided one way or another. The damage suit is a natural sequence of government by injunction, which evil has become so thoroughly intrenched that it cannot be abolished without overtoppling the whole system that it safeguards, and any thoughtful person can readily see where union funds can be tied up or confiscated, or where the home-owning members in an organization can be held responsible for losses sustained by employers in a strike or boycott, that a new and grave danger has arisen. The shibboleth of many unions during the past dozen years has been "high dues and a strong treasury," but where the capitalists can raid the financial strength of an organization it looks as though the workers are supplying the sinews for their own undoing. But instead of discouraging the progressive workers, this new turn of affairs should spur them on to educate their fellows to meet the issue intelligently and fearlessly. Old methods and political idols must be relegated. The time has come to place class-conscious men in the halls of legislation and the administrative offices. Otherwise the capitalists will continue to have the advantage and laugh in their sleeves at the stupidity and cowardice of labor.

Heretofore we were wont to regard the East as the leading section of Socialist activity and success. When Massachusetts sent three members into the Legislature and carried Brockton, Haverhill, Amesbury and several of the smaller places, it looked as though New England would be the banner district for some time. But the victories of the Yankees merely served to encourage the Westerners to fight all

the harder, and the results of the recent municipal elections indicate that the Eastern Socialists will have to look to their laurels. Chicago has gained a foothold in the city government by electing an Alderman; in Sheboygan, Wis., the Socialist Party swept the city, electing Mayor, City Attorney, Treasurer, Assessors, Justices of the Peace, five Aldermen, three Supervisors and two school Councilmen; in Racine, Wis., an aldermanic candidate won; in Telluride, Colo., the Socialist Party gained an Alderman; in Red Lodge, Mont., two out of three Councilmen; in Anaconda, Mont., Mayor, Police Judge and three out of six Councilmen; in Battle Creek, Mich., two Aldermen, making a total of four; at Pine River, Mich., Supervisor and also Commissioner; in Kenosha, Wis., an Alderman, Supervisor and School Director; in Two Rivers, Wis., an Alderman and School Commissioner; in Kiel, Wis., the Mayor; in Plymouth, Wis., an Alderman; in Marion, Ind., two Councilmen; in Rich Hill Mo., the Mayor and the Marshal; in Boone, Iowa, a Councilman; in Liberal, Mo., a Councilman; in Mystic, Iowa, a Councilman, and there are still some counties to hear from by slow freight. In scores of cities and towns west of the Alleghanies the Socialist Party vote doubled and trebled, and the old party politicians only saved themselves from defeat in many places by uniting the Republican and Democratic parties in a so-called Citizens' party. The tide is steadily rising, and the capitalist politicians will do well to prepare their rafts for a flood.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Germany.

Vorwaerts publishes the following table showing the relative strength of the various parties in Germany at the present time, and incidentally showing how effectually the Social Democrats have been discriminated against in the Parliamentary representation. We preserve the German names of the parties throughout rather than to attempt to translate them, owing to the fact that in some cases various translations have found their way into the English language:

Party.	Votes.	No. of Representatives. votes to each Rep.	
Sozial-Demokraten	2,107,076	56	37,626
Centrum	1,455,139	110	13,228
National-Liberale	971,802	47	20,666
Konservative	859,222	54	15,911
Freisinnige Volkspartei	558,314	29	19,252
Deutsche Reichspartei	343,642	23	14,941
Antisemiten	284,250	10	28,425
Polen	244,128	14	17,437
Freisinnige Vereinigung	195,682	12	16,307
Andere Parteien	143,658	14	10,261
Bayrischer Bauernbund	140,304	4	37,576
Bund der Landwirthe	110,389	8	36,796
Suddeutsche Volkspartei	108,528	8	13,566
Elsasser	107,415	8	13,427
Welfen	94,359	9	10,484
Danen	15,439	1	15,430

There comes to the office of the International Socialist Review each month clippings of all matters relating to Socialism appearing in the entire German press. Just at the present time these clippings, so far as the capitalist press is concerned, would seem to indicate a sort of panic on the part of the opponents of Socialism. "Gegen die Sozial Demokratie" (down with the Social Democrats) is the favorite watch-word of the clerical and reactionary press, which is filled with various suggestions of methods with which to combat the impending danger. The Romische Zeitung has a long article on the influence of the Social Democratic propaganda on the Catholic population, and after admitting that Socialism is making great inroads among Catholics, con-

cludes by saying, "Here complaints and murmurs will not help things. Nothing but positive, practical work of reform in the social and political field will be of any effect." It is needless to say there is no suggestion of just what this reform is going to be.

Recently a Farmer's Congress was held in Berlin and the Cabinet went bodily in their official capacity to participate in its deliberations. One of the Socialist representatives rose in the Reichstag the next day and asked if this was to be considered as a precedent, and if the Cabinet would attend the next trade union congress that met in Berlin. Count Posadowsky, the presiding officer of the Cabinet, replied in the negative, and the capitalist press in commenting on it declared the question an insulting one, since all trade union congresses were directly under the control of the Socialists and it would be inviting the government to participate in its own destruction.

The Dresden Journal declares that the diminution of the Socialist danger is the great task of the next election.

The great campaign fund which the workers of Germany are gathering for the coming elections is another source of worry to the capitalist papers, and they are claiming that no fund of this size could be collected without the assistance of other than laborers and are attempting to use this as proof that the Socialists are not a party of the working class. Meanwhile, the Social Democrats are gathering and organizing their forces for the tremendous battle which lies before them. They have carefully selected the districts which are doubtful and are concentrating their forces upon these. A long list of such districts was published in a late issue of the *Vorwaerts*, and it is seen that in very many of them the number of additional votes needed by the Socialists for victory is very small.

Meanwhile the Socialists of other countries are giving evidence of the International solidarity of the Socialist movement. The Belgian Socialists have sent 1,280 francs directly from their central treasury and at the same time sent out an appeal to the various local organizations asking them to assist in this matter. Several organizations in the United States have sent small sums and assistance has also come from other European countries. Needless is it to say that the Emperor is decidedly uneasy in these days. Seeking to escape from the ubiquitous Social Democracy at home he fled to Denmark, only to be welcomed by the Social Democratic Mayor of Copenhagen. Latest press dispatches declare that in despair he is now talking of turning Socialist himself. Simultaneously the word comes that he has started a labor paper as a final means of fighting the Socialists. Perhaps both reports are true, as Wilhelm II. is evidently in a very much disturbed state of mind.

Austria.

The Social Democratic Congress of Lower Austria was held at St. Poelton on Feb. 15 and 16. Owing to the fact that there had been a decrease in the vote at the last Parliamentary election there was some feeling of discouragement, but this decrease was largely account-

ed for on the grounds of the disfranchisement of large numbers of the workers through election trickery, and, in the second place, by the deception practiced by the Christian Socialist party. As a result there was a very strong feeling against the Christian Socialist party and a resolution was adopted declaring them to be the greatest enemies of the working class at the present time, and stating "that the fighting and conquest of the Christian Socialist Party is not only demanded by the interest of the laboring class in its battle for freedom, but is also an essential of the further development of our whole culture."

Here, as everywhere, the peasant population constitutes a great obstacle to the advance of Socialism. Comrade Hoeger declared that "the farmer is first of all a possessor and strives continuously to increase and add to his possessions even at the cost of his friends and relatives, and by all possible means. His heart clings above everything else to possessions. Even the farm laborer thinks only of the possibility of securing land and property. Whoever strives only for possession, however, can, according to my opinion, never become a proletarian Social Democrat." He concluded by declaring that "we should remain with our members who have made the Social Democratic movement great, the industrial laborers, and perfect their organization."

There was considerable opposition to this, although even those who maintained the possibility of winning the farmer admitted that their allegiance seemed to be very uncertain.

Finland.

The Socialist Party in this country, although newly organized, has already won some notable victories. Some time ago two Socialists were elected to the Municipal Council of Helsingfors, the Finnish capital. These were Comrade Drockila, a newspaper man, and Comrade Hackland, a miller. At a more recent election held in the city of Tamersfors three Socialist Councilmen were elected.

Another sign of rapid growth is found in the success of the Socialist press in Finland. Three large dailies are already published in the Finnish language, and a weekly paper in Swedish. The weekly circulation of these newspapers amounts to 80,000 copies. This is really remarkable, in view of the fact that the whole population of Finland is less than three million, while the number of industrial laborers of the country does not exceed 80,000.

A still more significant sign of the growing strength of the working class movement in Finland is found in the fact that the employers' association of Helsingfors recently decided on its own motion to close the factories on the 1st of May, the international labor holiday.

Thus far the Socialist Party of Finland has no complete written program. The lack of such a document is being more and more acutely felt, and steps are now being taken to provide one. The outline for the program which seems most likely to be adopted is the one developed by the school of Socialist propagandists at Abo, whose most conspicuous member is Comrade Painio. This outline, which

has many points in common with the new program adopted by the Social Democracy of Austria, will, after a preliminary discussion by the locals of the party, be submitted to the National Congress which is soon to be held. Its adoption will naturally strengthen the Finnish labor movement by giving it more unity of action.

Unfortunately by the side of this movement which is so rapidly developing there is arising a terrible danger in this country. That is to say, the increasing invasion of Finland by the despotism of Russia. The principal conditions which have favored the growth of the labor movement are the liberties and political rights enjoyed by the working class, thanks to the relatively liberal Constitution of Finland. If the plans of the Russian bureaucracy are carried out these liberties will disappear along with the autonomy of the Grand Duchy and the Finnish working class will be subjected to the same system of arbitrary oppression already inflicted upon the working class of Russia and Poland.

Thus the Finnish proletariat is, like the other classes of the population of this country, interested in defending the autonomy of Finland against the encroachments of Russia, since this autonomy involves the political liberty indispensable for the normal development of the proletariat. Its interests, however, will be closely linked with those of the laborers of other countries and especially with the revolutionary Socialists of Russia. Finland alone will be helpless against the Russian autocracy, but the united revolutionary movement of Russia will sooner or later overthrow the Czar.

New Zealand.

At last there seems to be some sign of the awakening of the proletariat of New Zealand. It may come with somewhat of a shock to those who have looked upon New Zealand as already well on the way to Socialism to learn that it is behind almost every other nation in the world in this respect, and that the first germs of the Socialist movement are just beginning in that country. Comrade La Monte, who is familiar to most of our readers as a translator and writer of Socialist literature, is now located at Wellington, New Zealand, and sends us a number of papers giving an account of the recent formation of a Socialist Party in that city.

This party adopted the following platform for the municipal election:

"The Socialist Party appeals strongly to men and women of all classes who are willing to join the workers in their struggle against oppression and exploitation, and for emancipation. It confidently relies for present support and future victory upon the workers of Wellington, and especially upon those workers who have shown their consciousness of the class struggle by joining the trades unions of their crafts, and it appeals to them and to you to support the Socialist ticket during the coming contest.

"Workers of Wellington, unite under the banner of the party of your own class, the Socialist Party! You have nothing to lose but your chains, and a world to gain!

"We will present to you in due course working men as candidates

for seats on the City Council, pledged, if elected, to work for the following measures in your interests:

"1. The erection by the City Council of houses to meet the requirements of the citizens, such houses to be let at a rent just sufficient to cover interest, sinking fund and maintenance.

"2. The establishment by the city of municipal coal depots to distribute coal to the people at cost.

"3. The erection by the city of retail and wholesale markets for meat, fish, fruit and provisions of all kinds.

"4. The establishment of municipal institutes and refreshment rooms, as the first step towards municipalizing the food and drink supplies of the citizens.

"5. The acquisition or erection by the city of a plant or plants to light the streets and furnish light to stores, houses, etc.

"6. The erection of municipal abattoirs.

"7. The abolition of the contract system on public works. Direct employment of labor by the city, at union wages, and under union conditions."

Comrade La Monte assures us that it was difficult to get even this much Socialism into the platform of the Socialist Party in New Zealand.

At this meeting the party put itself on record against the conciliation and arbitration act and numerous trade unionists pointed out that this act had been of no avail to the unions of that country. This has stirred up the capitalist press, and they are attacking the Socialists most vigorously. Among the items which are noted in these papers, however, are some which tell of trade unionists being compelled to wait in vain outside Minister Seddons' office in the hope of securing governmental action, and complaints appear here and there of lack of work.

The first number of "The Commonwealth," the first Socialist paper to be published in New Zealand, and of which Comrade La Monte is the editor, has come to hand. It has the old familiar ring of the International Socialist movement, and the probability is that the time is not far distant when New Zealand will really take her place in the ranks of the nations of the world in the battle for Socialism.

Holland.

It is difficult to give any satisfactory statement concerning the situation in Holland until further information shall be received. As most of our readers know from the reports of the daily press a general strike was declared, and, in spite of this fact, the anti-strike law was passed through the Chamber, which then at once adjourned. Under these conditions the strikers thought it best to declare the strike off, as there was no possibility of the attainment of their end during the time in which they could remain on strike. Contrary to the statements which have been published in anarchist papers, the Socialists of Germany assisted them while they were out on strike, and the Vorwaerts continuously encouraged and endorsed their action.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Pit. By Frank Norris. Doubleday, Page & Co. Cloth, 421 pp., \$1.50.

It is impossible to discuss this book without to some degree comparing it with "The Octopus," which formed the first of a series of works of which there were to be three, "The Pit" constituting the second, had the work not been unfortunately interrupted by the death of the author. Many of the critics have declared this book to be superior to "The Octopus," but we cannot agree with their judgment. There is strength in "The Pit," but it is a more conventional strength than that displayed in "The Octopus." When the author leaves the soil he seems to lose something of the crude, primeval power which accompanied his first work. "The Pit" deals with a gigantic wheat speculation in Chicago, and its moral is the resistless power of wheat as opposed to man. While Jadwin, the hero, is financially crushed beneath the tremendous flood of wheat that pours in from the Northwest, one cannot but feel that there is by no means the certainty that his defeat was not due to some oversight or lack of financial strength which might be at least within the bounds of human possibility, and there is not, consequently, the same tremendous, unconquerable force which is to be found in "The Octopus." The strongest passage in the whole book, and which reminds you most forcibly of the author's earlier work, is his description of the wheat pit on the Chicago Board of Trade.

"Thus it went, day after day. Endlessly, ceaselessly the Pit, enormous, thundering, sucked in and spewed out, sending the swirl of its mighty central eddy far out through the city's channels. Terrible at the center, it was, at the circumference, gentle, insidious and persuasive, the send of the flowing so mild, that to embark upon it, yielding to the influence, was a pleasure that seemed all devoid of risk. But the circumference was not bounded by the city. All through the Northwest, all through the central world of the wheat the set and whirl of that innermost Pit made itself felt; and it spread and spread and spread till the grain in the elevators of Western Iowa moved and stirred and answered to its centripetal force, and men upon the streets of New York felt the mysterious tugging of its undertow engage their feet, embrace their bodies, overwhelm them and carry them bewildered and unresisting back and downwards to the pit itself.

"Nor was the Pit's centrifugal power any less. Because of some sudden eddy spinning outward from the middle of its turmoil, a

dozen Old World banks, firm as the established hills, trembled and vibrated. Because of an unexpected caprice in the swirling of the inner current, some far-distant channel suddenly dried, and the pinch of famine made itself felt among the vine dressers of Northern Italy, the coal miners of Western Prussia. Or another channel filled, and the starved moujik of the steppes, and the hunger shrunken coolie of the Ganges' watershed fed suddenly fat and made thank offerings before ikon and idol.

"There in the center of the Nation, midmost of that continent that lay between the oceans of the New World and the Old, in the heart's heart of the affairs of men, roared and rumbled the Pit. It was as if the Wheat, Nourisher of the Nations, as it rolled gigantic and majestic in a vast flood from West to East, here, like a Niagara, finding its flow impeded, burst suddenly into the appalling fury of the maelstrom, into the chaotic spasm of a world-force, a primeval energy, blood-brother of the earthquake and the glacier, raging and wrathful that its power should be braved by some pinch of human spawn that dared raise barriers across its courses."

One looks in vain for the social teachings which permeated his other works and which really gave life to it. We cannot but feel that this defect is in a large degree responsible for the greater weakness and has at the same time insured to it the more favorable attention of the conventional critics.

The American Cotton Industry. By T. M. Young. Chas. Scribner's Sons. Cloth, 155 pp., 75 cents.

This consists of a series of articles originally contributed to the Manchester Guardian by an English weaving expert who spent some time in America. It is written entirely from the technical point of view to afford information to the weaving capitalist. But it is really more than this; it is an extremely valuable handbook for the social student.

The author makes many very striking observations. He notes the fact that even Massachusetts is still behind England in factory legislation. Everywhere he points out the much greater productivity of the American worker as compared with the English. He frequently shows that measured by product wages are lower here than in England. Even in Massachusetts he finds also that "the faces of the weavers looked pinched and sallow and the arms of many of them were pitifully thin. I do not care how many dollars a week those people were earning they are badly off."

When he comes to visit the Southern mills he gives some interesting figures on wages. At one mill "the first girl to whom I spoke was running ten looms and gave her weekly earnings at \$2.08; the next, who had ten looms, too, said that she made \$2.50 a week, sometimes more and sometimes less; whilst the third, who had only eight looms, put her weekly earnings at only \$2, and complained that she was not allowed to have more looms. I supposed that she was a learner, and asked her how long she had been weaving; to my surprise she replied, 'Three years.'"

He makes one observation which is most striking when we remem-

ber that it is injected into the midst of the most technical form of language on wefts, picks and warp, splashers, drillers, etc.

"As the train came into Columbia a curious little procession passed up the street. About a score of black convicts, dressed in an ugly uniform of dirty white cotton, with broad black stripes, carrying picks and shovels over their shoulders, and chained together, two and two by the ankle, swung up the hill, followed by a white man with a rifle. It was the chain gang returning from its day's labor upon the roads. And about the same time, I suppose, white children of 12 years old, no more free agents than the convicts, were filing into the mill at Barnesville to begin their long night of toil amongst the tireless machines."

"What I Saw in South Africa." By J. Ramsey McDonald. "The Echo." Paper, 135 pp., 6d.

This is the record of the visit of the well known English Socialist to South Africa shortly after the war. This is for its compass one of the best general surveys of the present situation in the Boer country that has ever been published. It gives a series of sharp, searching pictures of the situation, outlines various forces that are at work there, and suggests something of probable future revolution.

"Tactics and Strategy." By Thomas Bersford. Author. Paper, 69 pp., 15 cents.

This is a work which consists mainly of personal opinions given with a very authoritative air. Some of the suggestions which are offered are excellent, some in our opinion are silly, and others decidedly pernicious. This latter applies especially to the attempt which is made to arouse antagonism along lines of occupation among the workers and to encourage independent organizations along sex lines. The work, however, enters on a new field and will be welcomed as a first attempt to reduce to system what has often been chaotic—the work of agitation and organization for Socialism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Britain for the British.

Without doubt the writer that has been most successful in popularizing the thought of Socialism is Robert Blatchford. His book, "Merrie England," has already had a circulation of considerably over a million, and is still selling rapidly. He has, however, written a much better book than "Merrie England," under the title of "Britain for the British." This work has already reached a circulation of several hundred thousand copies in England, and it is gradually making its way in this country. The title helps it there and to some extent hinders it here. The central thought of the book is that Great Britain is now owned by, and run for, a small class of parasites, whereas the working class might and should own it themselves, and run it to suit themselves. The arguments apply as well to America as to England, and the book is as useful here as where it was written. It is far better propaganda than "Merrie England," since the former book had little to say of the class struggle and was quite as likely as not to leave its readers disposed to vote for the "New Democracy" and subscribe to the Hearst newspapers. "Britain for the British," on the other hand, emphasizes the need of a distinctively working class party, and the brief appendix to the American edition by A. M. Simons points out that the Socialist Party is the only one deserving the confidence of American workingmen.

In the January issue of the International Socialist Review we published the opinion of Eugene V. Debs on this remarkable book. We give here a few extracts from reviews of the work written by prominent English Socialists:

Ben Tillett: The press may not accept "Britain for the British" because it is said to foster a Britain for the British few. It is a great moral book, without suspicion of preaching. A charity permeates it throughout, broad as the brotherhood of man it teaches. Its pure sympathy, the tender lovingness of its appeal should go straight to the heart and understanding of all who want the world for the world's workers, and "Britain for the British."

J. A. Hobson: The waste, the folly, the cruelty and injustice of the present industrial order, as set forth in Mr. Blatchford's pages, are so gross and palpable, the remedy is so clear, simple and intelligible that, laying down the book, one asks, "Why haven't we done it?"

Harry Quelch: No man, I think, possesses to a greater degree than our friend Blatchford the faculty for saying what he wishes to say

in a pleasing and attractive fashion, in plain and simple language—understood of the common people.

George Bernard Shaw: There are very few men who can write as Blatchford does, with conscience and strong feeling; and yet without malice. We have plenty of political essayists who write without malice; but it is easy to be polite when you are indifferent to your subject, and are really concerned about nothing but your own manners and style. We have a few who write with conscience and strong feeling; but they begin with virtuous indignation and culminate in venom. Blatchford keeps his temper, and treats the heathen as fellow men to be converted, not as reptiles to be scotched.

"Britain for the British" is published in cloth at 50 cents and in paper at 25 cents, including postage to any address. The usual discount is allowed to stockholders in our co-operative company.

Emblem Buttons.

In 1902 the Socialist Party of America, by referendum, adopted for its official emblem the design of a pair of clasped hands across a globe surrounded by the words, "Socialist Party: Workers of the World Unite." A variety of emblem buttons have been manufactured in accordance with this vote, but most of them have been extremely unsatisfactory in appearance and particularly by reason of the fact that the words "Socialist Party" appeared in small black letters on a dark red background and were almost illegible without close examination. This of course defeats the main purpose of the button, which is to familiarize workingmen everywhere with the fact that the Socialist Party is in existence.

We have lately had designed a new button, in which the lettering appears in white letters on a red background and in which the letters are also somewhat larger than in previous designs, so that the words "Socialist Party" can easily be read at some distance from the eye. The general appearance of the button is also more tasteful than that of any other manufactured in accordance with the referendum vote. We are now manufacturing these buttons in large quantities and are thus able to announce a reduction in prices which will hereafter be as follows:

To our stockholders, 20 cents a dozen; \$1.50 a hundred postpaid; to others, 30 cents a dozen; \$2.00 a hundred postpaid.

A Gift to the Socialist Party Organization Fund.

The editorial pages of this month's Review explain the urgent need of a national organization fund for the Socialist Party. We have to announce that William English Walling has given twenty-five shares of stock in our co-operative publishing company to be sold for the benefit of this organization fund. Any Socialist Local or individual may obtain one of these shares by sending \$10.00 to this office at once and the full amount of the remittance will be turned over in the name of the remitter to William Mailly, National Secretary, to apply on the

organization fund. The holder of each share of stock so bought will have the privilege of buying literature at cost the same as if the share had been subscribed for in the ordinary way. It is of the utmost importance to the Socialist Party that this fund be raised quickly, and we trust that our readers will make a prompt response to this offer.

The Standard Socialist Series.

The eighth volume, "Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy," by Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis, is now ready. It is an indispensable book for any one desiring to speak or write intelligently upon Socialism. The other numbers of the series are as follows:

1. Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs. By Wilhelm Liebknecht.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde.
3. The American Farmer. By A. M. Simons.
4. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-Operative Association. By Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. By Frederick Engels.
6. The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels.

These books are handsomely bound in silk cloth, stamped with a uniform design, and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents a volume. Stockholders in our co-operative company have the privilege of buying them at 30 cents by mail or 25 cents by express at purchaser's expense. Two booklets, "What to Read on Socialism" and "Co-Operation in Publishing Socialist Literature," will be mailed free on request.

Rev. Stewart Sheldon's Book.

"The Root of All Kinds of Evil," the publication of which was announced last month, is a remarkable book, coming as it does from one who has spent a lifetime in the orthodox Christian ministry. The author has re-discovered for himself the truth familiar to Socialists but denied by most members of his profession, that personal character is to a great extent the product of economic conditions, and can most readily be improved by improving these conditions. Starting with premises drawn from the Bible, and using the phraseology familiar to religious people, the author leads up fairly and logically to the conclusion that the way to establish the "Christ order" is to vote and work for the Socialist Party. Paper, 10 cents.

God's Children—A Modern Allegory.

This new book by James Allman is the most readable description of our present capitalist civilization that can be found. The author represents God as desiring to secure accurate information regarding

the welfare of his children on this planet, and as sending Mercury on a tour of inspection. The heavenly messenger, after getting some preliminary advice from the recording angel, lands in London, and at once begins a series of varied and instructive experiences. We will not spoil the reader's enjoyment of the book by detailing any of them here. It need only be said that "God's Children" is an entertaining story from start to finish, and at the same time is a powerful argument for Socialism. The book is handsomely printed and bound and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents.

Class Struggles in America.

This new work by A. M. Simons is something far more important than its size or price would indicate. It is the first definite beginning in the task of writing the history of the United States in the light of the principle of economic determinism. Incidentally, the clear and simple style of this book, together with the fact that it treats of things near at home and familiar, will make it a help to any who may have found the thought of economic determinism a difficult one to grasp. Paper cover, 10 cents, postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

JUN 12 1903
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JUNE, 1903.

NO. 12.

The Possibilities of Socialism in China.

THE internationalism of socialist doctrines is proven again by the fact that a socialist movement has already been launched in China—not by missionaries from Europe or America, but by Chinese scholars and reformers. Reports of socialist propaganda are regularly received from all parts of Europe, from South Africa, South America, Australasia and Japan, but China has, up to the present, been unheard from.

There are probably 100,000 Chinese in America, the chief centers being San Francisco, California and Victoria, British Columbia. Efforts to explain the principles of socialism to the Asiatics in Canada have been futile, owing to their limited knowledge of the English language. The recent visit to America of the great Chinese reformer, Leung Kai Chew, afforded an opportunity, however, of securing and giving information, the results of which I will briefly outline.

Leung Kai Chew is an exile from China, having been a warm friend of the late emperor. He is now editor of "Sien Min Choong Boa," published in Yokohama, Japan, his visit to America being in the interests of the Chinese Reform Association, of which he is honorary vice president. As an educationalist, author, historian, etc, Mr. Leung (to use his name in the "civilized" manner) is in the front rank of Chinese notables, although he appears to be only about 35 years of age.

An interview was easily secured as soon as Mr. Leung was informed by his interpreter, Kang Yu Wei, that socialism was the topic on which information was desired. As an introductory Mr. Leung was handed copies of the Seattle and Vancouver socialist publications and a brief description of the growth and strength of socialism as an international political working-class movement was given in writing. In addition to this the principles of collectivism and the class-struggle were explained and a series of questions were asked regarding the possibilities of a movement being established in China.

Before allowing himself to be interviewed Mr. Leung proved his capability as a political leader by interviewing the interviewer. He stated that he had read books written by Karl Marx, Proudhon and St. Simon and that a Chinese translation of Marx's greatest work, "Capital," is almost completed. It will be published during the present year. He is a friend of Sen Katayama, publisher of the "Socialist," Tokio, Japan, and reports the socialist movement to be very strong in the Tokyo district. Yano, formerly Japanese ambassador to China, has just published a novel similar to Bellamy's "Equality."

Mr. Leung first desired to know where socialism was strongest and as to the strength in the various countries. These questions were followed by others, asking if socialism was like Plato's "Ideal Republic," and if its American advocates believed in "dividing up." "Is socialism connected with Nihilism?" "Do you favor the plan of profit-sharing?" "Are you connected with the trades unions?" "Do you endorse labor strikes?" "What is your attitude on the question of Chinese exclusion?" "How can the workers get larger wages and yet work only three or four hours per day?" "How will you take over the railroads and other large industries?"

The variety of questions above enumerated afforded an excellent opportunity to supply information—an occupation all socialist agitators enjoy. The wonderful growth of the socialist vote in America and Germany; the fact that idealists had painted many word-pictures of better systems of society, but at no stage in history until the present was socialism possible; that socialism will end the present system of "dividing up" under which the capitalist takes \$5 out of every \$6 produced by labor; that socialism is rapidly displacing Nihilism in Russia; that profit-sharing is a reactionary palliative and co-operative stores only make it possible for the workers to live on smaller wages; that while the socialist party endorses the labor unions and strikes as the industrial weapon of the working class we realize that the capitalistic judges have put the unions up against a stone wall and the political strike at the ballot box is the only weapon left for the worker; that Chinese exclusion laws are unworkable, as the capitalists will buy their labor power in the cheapest market and even though the capitalist government and courts enforced such a law the capitalists would merely take the factory to the worker in China, instead of bringing the Chinese cheap labor to the factory in America; that the use of labor-saving machinery, the abolition of useless labor, such as advertising, commercial travelers, bookkeeping, etc., as shown by the trusts would make it possible for the worker to decrease his hours of labor fully two-thirds and by securing the full product of his toil have all his de-

sires satisfied; and that while some socialists favored expropriation and compensation, others contended that as labor had produced all wealth under a socialist state, labor should merely take control of industry and decree that in future all members of society should perform productive labor—compensation would result in establishing a class of parasites living on interest.

The above points were touched upon in answer to the questions, Mr. Leung making the comment that it was good doctrine, but would probably take a century for socialism to be established universally throughout the world. The illustration was made that just as an avalanche starts as a snowball on the top of a mountain, gathering more snow and more speed as it glides on its downward path, so will the socialist vote and industrial revolution gather speed and reach its climax much sooner than present conditions indicate.

In replying to the writer's questions Mr. Leung stated that one of his books, "Socialism between the Chinese and other Asiatic Races," was a comparison of Karl Marx's writings with those of Confucius, Mencius, Suentsi and Wong Le Chew, all of whose writings in Chinese were very socialistic. No socialist candidates have ever been nominated in China for the simple reason that no elections are held in that country for municipal or national offices. He was favorable to the organization of a socialist party in China as soon as a constitutional government could be established.

The Chinese reform movement aimed at securing a new constitution with a democratic government elected by the people themselves. For the present all that could be done in the way of socialist propaganda would be the establishment of a socialist literature. He had already published many extracts from Marx's writings in his paper, which had a circulation of 30,000 in all parts of China, but chiefly in the sea ports. Legally there is no freedom of the press, but the government is too weak to prevent the circulation of reform papers. It is unsafe, however, to hold lectures or public meetings other than in the treaty ports. Something might be done to educate the Chinese in America along socialist lines, but he could recommend no specific plan.

No caste system exists in China to prevent the growth of socialist teachings. The caste system was abolished 25 centuries ago, according to Mr. Leung, and to-day a Chinaman might be a poor laborer, to-morrow he might be rich and he could even become a noble if he is willing to pay the price. In this respect the Chinese is "alleesamee Melican man."

The Chinese reform movement, like socialism, has nothing to do with religion. It is purely political and is revolutionary in the sense that it aims to overthrow the present despotism and

establish democracy. In reply to a question from a socialist lady who was present, Mr. Leung said that the Chinese looked upon the women as equals to the men in every respect and if his cause triumphs and a new constitution is written for the Chinese empire it will provide for equal suffrage for both sexes. The Boxer movement had no good objects. It was started by robbers and encouraged by disloyal officials.

The Chinese reformer expressed a desire to keep himself informed upon the socialist movement and a list of addresses of leading socialists throughout the world was supplied him together with a number of small pamphlets and the following books: "Merrie England," "Leibknecht's "Socialism," Benham's "Peru Before the Conquest," Engel's "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," Leibknecht's "No Compromise, No Political Trading," "Socialist Campaign Book," Kautsky's "Social Revolution," and Vandewelde's "Collectivism." Some of these will undoubtedly be translated into Chinese and the work of sowing the right kind of seed in preparation for the harvest to come will go on until the industrial evolution advances far enough to gather the monster China into the socialist revolution.

G. Weston Wrigley,
Victoria, British Columbia.

Some Free Legal Advice.

THE trade unions see trouble ahead. The capitalists scheme to capture or tie up the labor war chests. How to protect them? While ultimately the solution of the problem merges in the general economic and political struggle, it presents some interesting legal phases. No doubt the trade unions will have abundant legal advice of competent legal talent. But this is no reason why suggestions should not come from outside of the limited circle of legal talent. Every one should contribute his mite. Ignorance of the law excuses no one—is a sound legal maxim. In our very ignorance, we may blunder, like the philosophers of ancient Greece, on a solution which may not occur to better informed minds.

The situation is this:

A trade union orders a strike, or a boycott, or in some other way interferes with the business of some employer, with the result that he suffers damages. The employer brings an action for damages against the union and recovers a verdict. Nothing wrong about this. The verdict against the union is in accord with the law—the capitalist law—of the land, and any other verdict would be a revolutionary verdict, which no capitalist judge can, will or should render, since he was not elected to do so. This, I repeat, is the capitalist-made law of the land, to which there are many exceptions, some of which I shall point out later. I contend that the unions have no ground for complaint. Given that the capitalist system is right and should be maintained, then the capitalist is entitled to the full protection of the law against any interference from any person or group of persons with his right to pursue any lawful occupation or enter into any lawful contracts with any person or persons. Let A be the capitalist. A has a right to establish a shop or factory and may hire people to work for him on terms mutually agreed upon and if B interferes with his right to conduct such shop or factory or with his right to enter into a “free” contract of employment with any person, and such interference results in damages to A, then A may hail B before a court of justice and B is sure to be mulcted in damages for the benefit of A. It makes not a particle of difference whether B is a natural person, a trade union or a corporation.

A's right to recover or his remedy against B may be made nugatory in the following instances, which are some of the exceptions to which I have alluded before:

a. Where B is the State and interferes in the exercise of its police powers.

b. Where B is one, several or all of the persons with whom A entered into relations of employment.

c. Where, while A's right to recover against B is not questioned, B's property is exempt from execution and placed beyond the reach of legal process on the ground of public policy.

Let us examine the propositions a, b and c.

Proposition a. All factory and tenement house laws owe their validity to the principle and the vast authority exercised by the Board of Health derives its sanction from the police powers vested in the State.

Proposition b. B may leave or threaten to leave the employment of A at any time, provided he is not under a contract of employment, and B will not be responsible for damages which he may cause thereby to A. And what one may lawfully do, several may lawfully combine to do. Several or all employes of A may combine and leave or threaten to leave the employment of A without becoming responsible for the damages resulting to A. If this proposition is correct, then it follows that if a trade union and its officers are composed of employes of A, it may do with impunity what would be actionable if it included other persons and its officers were outsiders. For then it would become a third and "interfering" party. To this general rule there are numerous exceptions and distinctions. Whether the courts will in the future follow the general rule or be guided by exceptions and distinctions no one can foretell. It all depends on the election returns, as Mr. Dooley has pointed out long ago. I merely offer some suggestions, and if the courts will hold differently, well, then I have made a bad forecast of the political weather.

Proposition c. Most people are familiar with the laws making certain property—household furniture, tools and homestead of certain value—exempt from seizure and sale for debt. The statutes of exemption are founded on the principle of public policy that it is not in the interest of the public and even the class of creditors, to strip the debtor of all means of earning a livelihood.

The principle of exemption of property from execution is at this moment of great interest to the trade unions. We will all admit that a law making union funds exempt from execution would be desirable. Assuming that the trade unions are powerful enough to force such a law through Congress or several legislatures, would not such law be set aside by the courts as unconstitutional? For we must not forget that in this country, unlike to England where judicial legislation is as rare as royal veto, the courts have always the last word to say. At first glance it seems that such a law would have no constitutional leg to stand upon. But upon closer inquiry the case appears less hopeless. The form under which this law is advocated—exemption of union

funds—is certainly objectionable. The objections which are likely to be urged against such a law would be: 1, that it is class legislation; 2, that the beneficiary is not a natural person; 3, that the exempted property and its intended use are not clearly described and the reasons for the exemption are indefinite. The first objection may be avoided by making the provision of the law general. The funds should be identified not by ownership, but by use. Bankers, brokers and lawyers may have their out-of-work funds. In answer to the second objection it will suffice to point out that the State exempts freely religious, educational and benevolent institutions from taxation, which, in fact means that it taxes other persons and organizations for their benefit. The third objection may be obviated by a definite designation in the statute of exemption of the particular funds exempted. So funds intended to assist men out of work by reason of sickness, or idleness caused by slack in the trade or strike may be designated as Unemployed Mutual Aid Fund or Out-of-work Insurance Fund. Indeed, it will require no unusual stretching of the principle of public policy to maintain the constitutionality of the statute exempting such funds. For it can be argued with force and reason that such a statute would tend to encourage the workingmen to save and set aside part of their earnings as an insurance fund to be used in case of sickness or idleness, which they will not be likely to do in the same measure if such funds may at any time be attached or levied upon, in which case the support of idle workingmen and their families would devolve on the community. Certainly, such law will undoubtedly demand that the funds may not be applied to any other purpose except as designated, but with that the unions can easily put up. Expenses necessary for the maintaining of offices, etc., may be met out of a minor fund that will tempt no litigation.

These suggestions are offered as a loophole through which the trade union war chests may escape the sheriff.

Another question arises. A statute exempting trade union funds, if passed, will undoubtedly provide for the incorporation of the body in control of the funds. Shall trade unions incorporate? It is my opinion that incorporation of trade unions on a large scale would be disastrous to the labor movement. The reasons for this view I shall give in another article. But a statute exempting union funds will create the only conditions under which a trade union may hold, control and use its funds for a certain purpose through an incorporated body. I say *through* an incorporated body. For the corporation should be a sort of an auxiliary body. The trade union itself should remain unincorporated, but every member, by joining the union, purchases a policy of insurance in the Out-of-Work Fund.

The strike funds are usually accumulated more from voluntary contributions than collection of dues. The law should authorise the collection and use of such funds. The term of out-of-work benefit must also be limited, but may be extended indefinitely by a majority vote of the policy holders. *Julian.*

Labor Politics in Great Britain.

DURING the past three years a remarkable change has come over the spirit of organized labor in Great Britain. Three years ago the trade union movement in this country stood shivering and doubting on the brink of politics. Its ears were filled with the din of socialist propaganda as carried on mainly by the Independent Labor Party in the provinces and the Social Democratic Federation in London; around it was the menace of marshalled capital growing into syndicates and trusts, and the first rumblings of the general attack on labor combinations, which has since been made through the press and in the law courts, were being heard. The Liberal party which, in spite of the defections of Conservatism of nearly every industrial center in the country, had managed to keep alive its claim to be the political custodian of the workers' well-being was split and dumb. Almost against its will, the Trade Union Congress, which met in Plymouth in September, 1899, resolved that an attempt should be made to co-operate with the socialists for political purposes. The pressure of events from without, rather than the enlightenment of wisdom from within, forced the trade union movement to enter politics as a party by itself, and cease to trust exclusively to the kindness, the sympathy and the support of either Liberals or Conservatives.

In the previous issue of this REVIEW, I have written of the first attempts to build up this new political movement, and on the editor's invitation I return to the subject. I do so all the more readily because the annual conference just held at Newcastle marks an important point in the life of the committee. It has suddenly grown from a babe to a giant. Two years ago, the Social Democratic Federation ceased to co-operate because, it alleged, the committee was not receiving sufficient support from the trade unions. What that support has been, the following table, setting out the number and membership of the affiliated trade unions, the number of affiliated trades councils, and the number and membership of the affiliated socialist societies, will show:

	T.U.'s.		T.C.'s		Soc. S's.		Increase.	
	No.	M'ship.	No.	No.	M'ship.	Total.	per cent.	
1900-1	41	353,070	7	3	22,861	375,931	—	
1901-2	65	455,450	21	2	13,861	469,311	24.83	
1902-3	127	847,315	49	2	13,835	861,150	83.5	

It must be noted that the membership returned in this table does not include trades councils, and the only duplication occurs

in the numbers of the socialist societies, which are partly included in the trade union totals. If the part of the membership of trade councils which does not belong to trade unions affiliated to the committee were added to these figures, the Newcastle conference can be said to have represented a million workers.

But even that figure minimises the significance of the movement. For it does not include the membership of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, nor the membership of a Scottish Committee, which deals exclusively with Scottish constituencies. The miners occupy a peculiar position. When the old Labor Representation League ran its labor candidates in 1874, the only two who were successful were miners, and when the Liberals made peace, for the time being, with that old League and brought it to an end, the miners' representatives were content to ally themselves with the Liberal party and, to this day, the one trade union staffed by Liberals and led by Liberal-labor officers is the Miners' Federation. Some of the district sections of the Federation would be quite willing to join the Labor Representation Committee, but the opposition of the central board has, as yet, been too strong. But a concession has had to be made, and Mr. Pickard, M. P., foreseeing the strength of the Labor Representation Committee, encouraged his members to vote for a parliamentary fund of their own, and boasted that the Federation could run seventy candidates itself. The members of the Federation are, in consequence, paying a special levy of one shilling per annum into a Miners' Parliamentary Fund and are preparing to run a certain number of candidates at the next election. That being so the membership of the Miners' Federation may properly be added to that of the Labor Representation Committee when one desires to give a true impression of the position of the labor representation movement; and when that is done it is found that the trade unionists who are now paying into parliamentary funds number at least 1,300,000—a larger number than is represented at the annual trade union congresses, which have been regarded as the most important gatherings of labor in this country. So much for the numerical strength of the movement.

What now, of its policy? Here again the Newcastle conference marks a definite step. The Labor Representation Committee was always understood to be independent, but there was an impression abroad that its independence was only nominal, and the Liberals had not ceased to hope that the Committee was only to be another agency for returning Liberal members to parliament. When a workman is returned to the House of Commons he becomes the center of a whirlwind of temptation. He generally catches the House of Commons fever, known to the man in the street as "swollen head," and the return of trade union officials—

some of whom have but little grasp of political problems outside the matters concerning their own industry—is of course a risky thing to promote if one has any systematic idea of the work of a labor party in parliament. The Committee has had its experiences in this respect. One of its four M. P.s is to this day asking the electors to admire him as opposed to the others because he is wise enough to support Conservatives, Liberal-Unionists, Liberals and Socialists at elections. Thus, he claims, he is gaining the maximum support for labor demands. This aberration of intellect and unfortunate lack of humor must always be expected from men who have to pick up an elementary knowledge of citizenship after they have been sent to the House of Commons, and when they go there as free lances before party discipline and loyalty are either understood or established.

This is one of the most threatening dangers ahead of the Committee. The old capitalist parties first adopted the policy of pooh-poohing the movement. Then they found it was serious and hoped to entangle it. A resolution definitely declaring for independence passed by 690,000 votes to 140,000 at Newcastle put an end to that hope. Now they are trying to detach one or two men, trying to get them to split up the movement, trying to cajole labor's own paid officials to strike the death blow to labor's most hopeful attempt at self emancipation. They will not succeed. The other three members of parliament elected under the auspices of the Committee (Mr. J. Keir Hardie, Mr. D. J. Shackleton and Mr. Will Crooks) understand the basis of the Committee and have not been cajoled either by the flattery of the press nor by invitations to dine out. At the next election, come when it may, at least twenty constituencies will be fought by our candidates without Liberal opposition, partly because the Liberals cannot afford to fight us and partly because the rank and file of Liberal electors are inoculated with the labor party views; and altogether thirty or forty of our candidates will go to the poll. It is always unsafe to prophecy the result of elections. But nine months ago, Mr. Shackleton running as an independent labor candidate and the nominee of the Trade Unions Independent Labor Party in the Clitheroe division was elected unopposed; whilst last month Woolwich elected the Committee's candidate, Mr. Crooks, and turned a Conservative majority of nearly 3,000 into a labor majority of 3,200. These elections, together with the present drift of public opinion, justify us in hoping that as a result of the general election a sufficient number of our candidates will be returned to constitute a most effective fighting group in the House of Commons.

With the exception of the Miners' Federation every trade union of any importance or size in the country is affiliated to the

Labor Representation Committee and is paying fees annually of 10s per thousand members. From this source the income of the Committee has been as follows: In 1900-01, £215; 1901-02, £225; 1902-03, £527.

But that is only an infinitesimal part of the money that is being spent in advancing Labor Representation. Societies like the Railway Servants are levying their members 1s per annum for parliamentary purposes, and it is reckoned that two years from now at least £50,000 will be passing each year into special political funds held by trade unions and the Labor Representation Committee. This is the most important feature of the present movement. It is built upon a financial foundation. The workers are finding their own parliamentary funds by an accumulation of coppers. The thing has never been done before. Belgium can draw upon profits made over the counters of co-operative stores, and Germany has newspapers trading profits. We, on the other hand, have no indirect income. We have devised a scheme by which we go straight to the workman, tell him what we want and get it from him.

The method which we have devised is as follows: Candidates for parliament must be members of affiliated societies, but as the Independent Labor Party is affiliated, socialists pure and simple, who have no trade union connection (people like myself for instance) have every opportunity of entering parliament as members of the labor group and of influencing the work of the Committee. As a result of the Committee's existence, the leading trade unions have resolved to find the expenses of candidates and to maintain them if elected to the House of Commons, and it has been clearly laid down by the recent conference at Newcastle that these candidates must be independent of both the Liberal and the Conservative parties and that they must be known purely and simply as labor candidates.

A section of the Socialists look upon the Committee with misgivings, but the Independent Labor Party co-operates harmoniously. The view of that party is that so long as the Committee keeps clear of Liberalism and Toryism and stands for labor interests, not only is it aiding the general increase of labor economic and political power, but it is preventing the trade union movement from going astray as it has already done after false political leaders. We are not afraid of socialism catching cold in this country; we are not afraid of co-operating, as socialists, in movements which are purely working class and which deal with the economic and political condition of the workers from an independent standpoint. We know that such movements must inevitably tend to socialism. So long as they do not hamper us in our own socialist propaganda, so long as we are frankly admitted into their

councils, so long as their platform is genuinely a common one upon which all independent labor sections can meet, the Independent Labor Party and its socialist membership will support such movements in spite of the opposition of a handful of more timorous and dogmatic socialists. We are even not particularly anxious to hasten the time when the Labor Representation Committee shall pass a socialist resolution. Such a resolution was very nearly passed at Newcastle. But as yet, the Committee has not emerged from the experimental stage, and it is much better that the men of influence in the unions should be forced by the logic of events to recognize the wisdom of the socialist position than that that position should be passed at an annual conference of the Committee by a bare majority. The Independent Labor Party think it better that the Committee should be taught socialism by its experience. That is, perhaps, an insularly English position. It recognizes, however, the special circumstances of English politics, and it is a most extraordinary coincidence that the year which has marked the almost phenomenal growth of the Labor Representation Committee has also been marked by the greatest number of socialist successes at municipal elections, the largest annual conference which the Independent Labor Party has ever had, and the issue of a balance sheet by that party showing the largest annual income ever collected by it, and a complete freedom from debt—a position in which it has not been for ten years. There cannot be the least doubt but that the work of this Committee has greatly stimulated the socialist movement in England.

The Committee is now engaged in getting together an efficient Parliamentary Fund by regular levies from its affiliated societies. From this fund, it proposes to pay its members of parliament a sum of £200 per session and to find one-fourth of the election costs of the returning officer. Over a hundred societies have already decided to subscribe one penny per annum per member to this fund and when the subscriptions are fully coming in this modest per capita levy will yield about £3,000 annually. This is quite apart from the ordinary office income and will be held as a separate trust fund to be used for parliamentary purposes only.

But all this is only laying foundations. The superstructure, I hope, will be a fully equipped *Parti Ouvrier*, which will place us in England in as proud a position as is occupied by our fellow socialists in Germany, Belgium or France.

J. Ramsey MacDonald,

Member of the London County Council, Secretary of the Labor Representation Committee.

Just To Think.

JUST to think of millions toiling,
Day by day,
For whate'er the lordly masters
Choose to pay,
Sets the thinker's blood a-boiling
Till he vows that this despoiling—
Come what may
In the shape of new disasters—
Has to stop,
Has to stop.

Just to think of children dying
In the slums,—
In that hell much worse than devil's,—
Soon benumbs
Fellow-feeling for those crying
"We on rich men are relying
For some crumbs,
Don't disturb the rich man's revels
Or we'll starve,
Or we'll starve."

Just to think of those same revels
And their cost,—
Cost in cash and kindly feeling,—
Worse than lost,—
All contentment soon dishevels;
Then one cries, "Incarnate devils
More had tost
To appealing wretches kneeling
For relief,
For relief.

Just to think of starving millions
Makes one curse.
Curse the social competition
So averse
To an equal chance at trillions
Earth has stored for human billions
To disperse;
Loudly curse the weak ambition
To be rich,
To be rich.

Just to think of God in Heaven
And of men,
Makes one want to know the reason,
Now and then,
Why it is one God or seven
Can't keep working righteous leaven
In man when
Greed incites to theft or treason.
Can you tell,
Can you tell?

Just to think of earth's perfection
If all shared
Free and equal in earth's treasures!
If all dared
To renounce—past resurrection—
Greed, and warfare's insurrection!
Were we spared,
For one day, unequal pleasures:
Just to think,
Just to think!

—*Edwin Arnold Brenholts.*

The Revolt of the Artist.



WE are nearing the close of a period which began in an emotional revolt, the frank object was the return to nature, the shaking off the shackles of conventionality, and the being of all hazards, frankly and freely natural, a period which has in its decline flatly contradicted the promise of its youth, and is ending in artificiality and sensationalism.

Emotional revolt, for the Anglo-Saxon, began about the middle of the last century. The intervening years between the close of the eighteenth century and that revolt, which was in effect the beginning of modern art life, were occupied in settling the confusion incident upon the struggles of the preceding century. It was a time of sordid money-getting. The only relief to its universal meanness was to be found in the pioneers, who going forth into the wilderness redeemed for men those waste places, which have since become so important and which now give promise of becoming dominating factors in the affairs of the world.

Succeeding this period of artistic barrenness an epoch dawned in which ardent hope and fierce revolt were manifest. Revolt intellectual, religious, political and consequently artistic dominated all its manifestations. The promises of the great revolution were called upon for fulfillment, the democracy armed itself, and authority tottered on its pedestal.

In 1847 Emerson visited England and it is evident that what he saw there inspired him with much appreciation and with many forebodings, for he says:

"In the absence of the highest aims of the pure love of knowledge and the surrender to nature, there is the suppression of the imagination, the priapism of the senses and the understanding. We have the factitious instead of the natural, tasteless expense, arts of comfort, and the rewarding as an illustrious inventor whosoever will contrive to introduce one impediment more between the man and his object." (English Traits.)

The complaints of Carlyle were still more savage than those of Emerson, until grown weary of his own enigmatic scolding, the great dyspeptic degenerated into a noisy apostle of fate, a "mad mullah" ruined by too little exercise and too much porridge.

But Emerson does not appear to have been able to explain the sterility and apathy, which he saw so clearly. His sympathies were all with the great industrial revolution, for as a citizen of a republic he was bound to rejoice in the promise of greater

equality, which, it appeared to him, must necessarily follow from it.

He speaks of the social change in terms of distinct approval. Thus we find him saying:

"The great powers of industrial art have no exclusion of name or blood. The tools of our time, namely steam, ships, printing, money, and popular education belong to those who can handle them and the effect has been that advantages once confined to men of family are now open to the entire middle class." (English Traits.)

The economic effects of the bourgeois revolt were in many respects sad and indeed cruel, but its intellectual and artistic possibilities had not yet made themselves felt. The disappearance of classicism was not yet recognized, and the feeble ghosts of its departed glories still stalked about the land. Turner, Lawrence and Constable overshadowed all, and their influence discouraged, so that the time was well-ripe for a rebellion against artificial authority. No poet had given out a new message, for Tennyson, the pianist of poetry, expresses little more than elegant conventionalities, wonderfully ornamental and particularly well-attuned to catch the ear of those in authority.

Browning, almost contemporary with this period of more or less latent revolt, which flickered and smouldered in riots, Chartist programs and Irish famines, subsequently flared into open rebellion and sedition on the European continent, and culminated in the United States, in the wildest and fiercest struggle of modern times, published *Pauline and Luria* before 1850. His poems, however, cannot be regarded as in any sense instigators or promoters of the new movement. The fundamental philosophy of his writings was not evident to the men of his times, so bound were they by conventionality and formalism.

Thackeray, it is true, satirised and flayed the aristocracy, but in a style which recommended itself to the privileged classes; the great reading public which could thoroughly appreciate his powers had not yet come into being, and in the works of Dickens alone do we find that healthy naturalism which was destined to appeal to the masses of men and to make itself felt in genuine sympathy and the broadening of humane effort.

In fact, this was one of the most dreadful periods of history. The laboring population toiled under conditions impossible of description, the unrestrained operation of the machine industry was making an Inferno out of what is at the best the purgatory of the life of the laborer, even women and little children were feeling the worst effects of the tyranny of circumstances and the greed for gain. In spite of the growth of the new industry, the landholders still controlled legislation and oppressed the

masses by the imposition of heavy duties upon the staple commodities, so that the bulk of the population sprawled helpless between the upper and nether millstones of industrialism and landlordism.

From this chaos sprang almost at once a new creation—the corn laws were abolished, British Free Trade was established, schools were founded, and the worst phases of the bondage of the factory were eliminated.

If we seek economic and material reasons for these changes they are not hard to discover, for the balance of wealth had shifted from the soil to the factory, and the factory, or rather the system of which the factory is the outward symbol, requires active and energetic individual effort, while the soil demanded merely passive obedience and patient toil.

But the revolt, though in its political aspect, the revolt of a class, was in its moral aspect the revolt of sentiment, and with the sentimentalists, at all events, the first fruits of victory rested. It was sentiment and that the highest and the finest which caused the first investigations to be made into the conditions of the laboring classes and religious sentiment, of an, up to that time, almost unheard of type, which sent the priests of the Church of England, awakened to a sense of duty by the Tractarian movement, into the slums of the great cities, and set them grappling with the monsters which they discovered there. Sentiment, too, it was, which caused Maurice and Kingsley to espouse the cause of the downtrodden, and sentiment which sent the New England missionaries from village to village to preach the liberation of the chattel-slave.

But, however, much the world owes to the sentimental enthusiasm of the church and the philanthropists during the transition period, it is no less indebted to the artists of that time, and to one group of artists in particular.

In 1848 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, entered the studio of Madox Brown, from which time a rejuvenescence of art may be dated, a new birth of independence and of individuality, and the beginning of a tendency which was far other than the youthful Pre-Raphaelites had in mind. The value of this movement lay in the fact that it was a *movement*, that it was a revolt, a new departure, a flinging to the winds of the traditions of centuries, and a call to a new mission, and new work for the artist. The school failed in itself, was smothered in its own details and subtleties, but what does not art on both sides of the Atlantic owe to its impulse?

But it was the motto rather than the actual accomplishments of the Pre-Raphaelites which inspired so many struggling artists and lifted the yoke of oppressive authority from their shoulders.

The school demanded and insisted upon a return to nature. That Brown and the others misunderstood the meaning of the expression and thought that the real return to nature lay in a slavishly imitative copying of detail, does not affect the value of their proclamation, which must still remain the watchword of all true artists, and a perpetual incentive.

The Pre-Raphaelites, however, did not appeal to the populace for the idea of popularity was repugnant to the members of the school, who were artists in the most exclusive sense of the term. Their acknowledged adherents were few in number; in more than one sense they constituted a narrow clique and their artistic fortunes, are a matter of interest to specialists and historians, rather than to the general reader. The pioneers of revolutions always suffer from the same defects of temperament. They are doctrinaires, narrow, fanatic, and dogmatic beyond measure, with an absolute faith in the complete soundness of their position, and a no less absolute contempt for any ideas which may clash with their own. Hence, they in themselves accomplish apparently but little, still, insensibly to themselves they break the inertia of conventional submission and set in motion a mass the direction of which will be probably quite other than that intended by the movers.

And so the Pre-Raphaelites with all their zeal for a return to nature persisted in not returning. The school found its impulse in medieval life and it never could dissociate itself from its origin, for it was not of its time, and could never appeal to living men and women of the nineteenth century. High ideals and good work cannot of themselves gain recognition for their possessors, comprehensibility is essential, and it was just in comprehensibility that the Pre-Raphaelites were lacking. Idealization and the power of handling detailed work were theirs in a very marked degree, but they failed utterly to understand human needs and for this reason were ignored by ordinary men and women.

This was a matter of small concern to the Pre-Raphaelites, and so to the development of art, for the artists now having become fairly imbued with the spirit of revolt, and breaking away, more and more, from tradition, launched into all descriptions of experiment so that the later art development has been in the direction of greater and greater individuality, until peculiarity of style has become almost a necessary prerequisite of success and popularity.

It has hence come about that idealism has ebbed away from the conceptions of art, and that technical considerations have become more and more the main tests of excellence and real power. Art is now considered apart from any moral import, it is no longer a matter of ethics, but purely of esthetics. Thus by

a curious meeting of extremes we find art threatened with sterilization and that for reasons just the opposite of those which confronted it when the Pre-Raphaelites made their fight. At that time a weight of authority crushed it into the ground and prevented the full expression of individuality, to-day, freedom of expression has smothered true individuality and is causing an increasing glorification of technique.

In one direction, that of decorative art, the work of the Pre-Raphaelites has not been without effect, and that not consciously but by a sort of indirection. The efforts of William Morris towards the rehabilitation of beauty in matters of ordinary every day life, the common tools of ordinary toil, the common implements of ordinary use, the books which we handle, the walls on which we have to look, and the furniture which we need for our ordinary comfort, have undoubtedly accomplished much, and these efforts owe their inception to the movement in the direction of revolt which took the cry of a return to Nature as its watchword. But even this movement has been largely vitiated by conscious quackery, and its comparative failure as an effort to incorporate the esthetic instinct in the visible works of the hands of our civilized workmen, is evident from the fact that there is no successor to Morris worthy of the name.

Still, perhaps, in what is known as the Arts and Crafts movement may be found the germs of a more representative art than we have yet enjoyed in these latter years, and at all events there can be little doubt that the efforts of the great English craftsman and his coworkers have contributed not a little to the general dissemination of esthetic education, which must necessarily, in the course of time, produce some more worthy results.

Austin Lewis.

The Three Crises of Marxism.



WHEN on the 14th of March, 1883, Karl Marx closed his eyes forever, Marxism had made decided progress, but it was still far from completely dominating International Socialism. A few years before Marxism, that is the theoretical and practical influence of the Marxian teaching had gone through its second crisis. The first came as a result of the International Revolution of 1848.

Here also the time of growth was followed by a time of crisis after recovering from which new ground was continuously won.

During the 40's there came a period of rapid advance in socialist thought and in the independence of the laboring class in Western Europe. Just as rapidly grew also the influence of Marx and Engels upon the most advanced portion of the proletariat. The International Band of the Communists stood firmly on its own feet in 1847 and issued the Communist Manifesto as its party program. In 1848 when the revolution broke out Marx was the editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, the main organ of the German revolutionists. The June Massacres brought this progress to an end. The counter revolution was victorious, and just as the advance of the revolutionary movement had specially favored Marxism so the downfall of the revolution struck it a heavy blow. It lost not simply its organ of publicity in Germany, its organization was not alone killed by police and courts, but democracy itself turned against it and rendered it systematically voiceless in Germany as well as in exile. Contemptuously Marx turned his back upon the quarrel of the emigrants and gathered together new weapons for the new impulse of the socialist movement of which in the darkest days of the reaction he was never for one moment doubtful.

And this new impulse came at the beginning of the 60's and therewith began the second period of the advance of Marxism. More extensive and powerful than before the revolution it moved everywhere in the labor movement and sought for objects and means with which to carry on the work of clarification and organization. Marx gave it both. He had not founded the International, it was in no way the work of any individual, but he did bring together for a single purpose the divergent forces that poured into it and thereby supplied strength to the International proletarian movement, which, without him, it could never have attained. A few years after the founding of the International he gave to humanity the deepest insight that had yet been attained into the economics of industry of the present society through the

publication of "Capital." The years from 1864 to 1870 were years of triumph for Marxism, it advanced from victory to victory and ever more and more won the joyful confidence of the laboring classes, but also the furious enmity of the ruling classes.

Then came the rise and fall of the Paris Commune, which formed the turning point in the "International" as the June massacres had done for the democracy of 1848. It released the rage of the ruling classes against the dreaded organization and its leaders. And the organization replied to the doubled and trebled rage of its attack, not with a closing up of its ranks, but with a division and fratricidal war which was much more injurious and destructive than the dissensions among the democratic emigrants of 1849.

As we have already seen Marx had with the greatest skill and tolerance brought together the divergent elements in the "International." Proudhonists and Blanquists of the Romance countries, English pure and simple unionists, and German Social democrats—but the maintenance of this combination became ever more difficult. The last congress of the "International" previous to 1870 had already shown great antagonisms particularly in regard to the agrarian question, where the small bourgeois Proudhonists with their respect for the landed interests and the private property stood opposed to those who defended in all possible ways modern technic and modern scientific agriculture, and common property in land. Continuous progress from victory to victory had not sufficed to hold these antagonistic elements together. The difficulties following the defeat set free the mutual reproaches and enmities of all the manifold non-Marxist elements.

It was Bakunin who gathered them together; to be sure not like Marx in a positive united activity, but only in order to cut all bonds, which had previously united them. It was given to Bakunin to destroy the Marxist International, but it was not given to him to put another in its place. After the Congress at The Hague in 1872 it fell to pieces.

Marxism was now in its second period of depression. In France all movement of the laborers was destroyed, anarchy reigned in the other romance countries, the English unions turned willingly to the bourgeois parties, and in Germany the Lassallians and Eisenachers were still fighting.

In Austria the movement had sunk from a beautiful blazing straw fire to a handful of ashes, in which a few sparks still dimly glimmered. And that greatest work of his life from which Marx had expected the revolutionizing of thought, "Capital" remained unnoticed.

So it was that the first half of the 70's was filled with dis-

appointment for Marx and Marxism, just as the second half of the 60's had been fruitful of favorable results.

The turn towards a new upward movement came this time not from France, or England, but from Germany. The German Social Democracy remained untouched by the otherwise universal retrogression of the independent labor movement, which the downfall of the Commune and the destruction of the International carried with it. In 1874 the German Social Democracy won a striking electoral victory, which brought about the era of results in Prussia, among which was the conclusion of the fratricidal strife, which had hitherto existed. From then on the growth of our party was almost continuous, being only transiently interrupted by the anti-socialist laws.

Soon after Marxism began to move in France, and anarchy and the pure and simple unionism to decrease. In 1876 "Egalite" was founded, edited by Jules Guesde, in co-operation with Lafargue, Deville and others, and in 1879 at the Congress of Marseilles the Marxian Labor Party was founded.

In Belgium, also, the laborers began to move in the second half of the 70's and stood practically, if not theoretically, upon the same ground as the German Social Democracy. The Socialist Party of Belgium, founded in 1879, is a party of the class struggle striving for the conquest of political power in order to free the laboring classes, and this is the distinguishing characteristic of practical Marxism.

At the same time the labor movement of Holland awoke out of the torpidity, into which it had fallen after the Congress at The Hague, and the Social Democratic Union in Amsterdam adopted the program of the German Social Democracy.

In Denmark, also, the end of the 70's saw a significant growth of Social Democracy.

Marx also lived to see the awakening of a Marxian Socialism in England, as well as (what was especially gratifying to him) the glorious heroic battle, which was led by the Russian revolutionists at the beginning of the 80's against absolutism. He followed this with enthusiasm and supported it wherever he could by advice and assistance with his personal connection.

The re-awakening of the Social Democratic and revolutionary movement and Marx's influence upon it broke at length the professorial conspiracy of silence. People began to criticise Capital and to "scientifically refute it." It needed nothing more than to be recognized in order to affect intellectual life. Its influence since then has grown in exactly the same degree that it has been "disproved."

At the time of Marx's death it was still impossible to say that his views and the tactics founded upon them dominated the In-

ternational labor movement. The romance countries especially were strongly tinged with Bakuninism and Proudhonism, and just at the time of Marx's death a sort of Bakuninism had gained a hold in Austria.

Even narrower than the sphere of practical Marxism was at that time its theoretical influence. Even in Germany where Marx's theories were better understood than anywhere else there were still many traces of the ideas of Dühring, Rodbertus, Albert Lange, to say nothing of the remnants of the old "forty-eighters" like Johann Jacoby and Rittinghausen.

When in 1877 the German Social Democracy founded a scientific periodical the "Zukunft" it did not stand upon Marxian basis, but on the contrary developed a directly anti-Marxian program without any voice being raised loudly in protest. The other scientific publication of socialism, which appeared in the German language at the time (the "Neue Gesellschaft" in Zurich) really had no program.

Almost at a single stroke all this was changed. Scarcely a decade had passed away before Marxism had conquered almost the whole socialist world, as was clearly shown by the International Congress of 1893. The ovation, which was extended to Frederick Engels at that time, was not simply to the personality of the veteran, it was equally to the teachings whose foundations he had helped to lay. Marxism had won not only the whole Slavic socialism, but had practically overcome anarchism in the romance world. It had even attained an influence in the English unions in the form of the new unionism.

It was not simply practical Marxism that had attained so dominating a position, but equally the theoretic. The multiplicity of socialist theories disappeared and only one remained of any significance, that of Karl Marx. The Theoreticians, who at the beginning of the 80's, still influenced wide circles of the laboring class and of the socialist intellectuals, such as Proudhon, Rodbertus, Dühring, Lange, Henry George and Schaffle, had lost all significance for the labor movement and socialist thought. The one theory which still played a part in the social democracy of romance lands alongside of Marxism, the "integral" socialism of Malon was no original uniform theory, but only a vari-colored mixture of odds and ends from all possible systems, Proudhonism, Marxism, Positivism, Schaffleism, etc.

But this great extension of Marxism was so by bounds that it was impossible for it to be permanent. The influence of rapid growth of Socialist Marxism had rendered it something fashionable, which everyone must know or else be considered behind the times. But nothing could be better suited to become a fashionable philosophy than Marxism, which is at the same time so fundamen-

tal and practical that it is not possible to remain on the surface of things or to dodge the difficulty of deeper investigation into it by mystical and mystifying phrases. If one is to understand Marx he must have knowledge and a tireless impulse to dig deeper. At the first approach to Marx one always secures a superficial and vulgar understanding of him, but if he is to truly comprehend him and solve the contradictions which exist between superficiality and the substance of things, between the apparent and the actual fundamental relations it is necessary to continuously widen the circle of one's own knowledge and then to bring this newly won knowledge ever again to the study of Marxian writings.

In Marxism, as with every fundamental philosophy investigation is necessary. For this the fashionable man has neither time nor inclination. The few empty formulas to which the fashionable Marxist reduces Marxism only lead him into insolvable contradictions with reality. Hence it was no wonder that he blamed Marxism for this and began quickly to revise his views, not by digging deeper, but rather by attempting to overthrow the entire teachings. They never noticed that the idea that they criticised and revised at bottom was nothing more than the creation of their own earlier mind.

But even if the Marxian teachings had been shallower the desertions of the fashion-loving element could not have been avoided, for the essence of fashion is in continuous change. The fashionable person wishes to astonish, differentiate himself from the mass of mankind so that he only follows the latest fashion of the time, while the great body of people cling on to the outgrown fashion. Once that a fashion has become universal the time has come for the fashionable person to change. So it happened that many young people played the part of strong Marxists so long as they thereby differentiated themselves from their comrades, but once that this Marxism had lost the attraction of newness they recognized how old it really was and there awoke in them a necessity for its revision.

So there has lately come about a third crisis in Marxism in course of which we now are, but which has been already well-nigh conquered.

With satisfaction we can testify to-day on the 20th birthday of Marx that it finds Marxism in much better condition than has any of its predecessors. Above all we have the main fact that practical Marxism has been almost completely untouched. The earlier crises of Marxism were the results of great practical defeats, they affected much more the practical than the theoretical movement. This latest crisis on the contrary arises in the very midst of the most complete triumphant course of practical Marx-

ism. It has no extraordinary occasion for existence unless we count as such the death of the second of the fathers of Marxism (Liebknecht).

One might, perhaps, refer to France and Italy as countries in which practical Marxism was in retreat. But the elements which have there broken loose from Marxism were only such ones as it had lately gained, and even there the defenders of solidarity of classes who are in the ranks of Socialist parties in those countries have not dared to make an open and decisive renunciation of the class struggle.

They do not oppose to the tactics of the class struggle any other decisive tactics, but satisfy themselves with pleading for freedom of thought and autonomy, with which beautiful words they designate the dissolution of all party discipline. However, we have in each of these countries a nucleus of the Marxian movement, whose strength and solidarity had been proven before 1893 and has not grown less since then.

Opposed to the relative retrogression in France and Italy are powerful advances in other places. The anarchistic crisis in Holland, which ten years ago was strong, is now completely overcome and practical Marxism grows and flourishes. In America finally a purely American social democracy exists, from which great results may be expected. In this same direction Russia must also be counted, where in 1893 the movement was greatly weakened. The young proletariat now moves powerfully forward in that country and that absolutely in the Marxian sense. Every step in the actual movement is, however, according to the well known words of Marx worth more than a hundred programs.

Meanwhile there is not a single place in which this latter crisis of Marxism has brought about any fundamental revision of our program, except in France, where the ministerial socialism places the socialist movement, as a product equally of the class struggle and the declaration of human rights of the French revolution, as antagonistic to liberalism, rather than the consequence of liberalism.

The theory upon which this peculiar program rests has not yet been stated. Above all this latest crisis of Marxism has brought forth no theory which can be opposed to Marxism. In spite of all criticisms and disfigurements to-day, as ten years ago, Marxism is the single, uniform, comprehensive theory of socialism. All the theories which were in full swing at the time of Marx's death are forgotten and no new one has yet appeared. The recently appearing attempt of David even is not a new theory of society, but only a new theory of one portion, agriculture, which he mechanically isolates and places in opposition to the totality of society. In industry David accepts Marxism; in agriculture he

is a sort of new Proudhonist. He himself claims to apply the Marxian method as he understands it. We shall have something further to say of this attempt, however, in another place.

As opposed to Marxism revisionism signifies neither a further development nor the substitution of another doctrine. It signifies nothing more or less than the rejection, not alone of the Marxian, but of every social theory; it stands in the same relation to Marxism as did the historical school of National economy to the classic economists.

As the Ricardian school dissolved it did not give way to a newer higher system of political economy, but to the historical school, which made a virtue of necessity and declared that all investigation into deeper economic relations was an empty speculation that could only be justified when the scientific facts of economics were insufficient. To-day the investigation of universal economic law is considered something out of date. The economic life is much too rich and manifold to be brought under universal laws. Not the universal, but the special, constitutes the content of modern economic science, not the investigation of laws, but the description of developments and results. The preliminary condition of science becomes with it the content of science itself.

To be sure something valuable can be accomplished in this manner for science, and the historical school is able to show some very significant results, especially in the field of economic history. It also must not be forgotten that even descriptive science, if it is to become anything more than a mere heaping-up of individual facts without purpose or aim, must proceed from definite theoretical principles, which lead them to choose from among the facts those which are typical and to group them. So, for example, statistics have given some very important results during the last decade, which make it possible for us to see many things much clearer than was possible for Ricardo and Marx with all their power of abstraction. But the first condition of useful statistics is a purposeful stating of a question, and this again presupposes a deep theoretical insight into the substance of the things to be investigated.

The historical school would not have been able to accomplish even that which it did if it had not (to be sure many times unconsciously) frequently made use in its investigations of the much despised abstractions of the great economic theoreticians. On the other side we must not forget that the classical economists as well as Marx, even if they did not have at their command all of the results of modern statistics had completely mastered what economic material in the way of facts existed in their time. This is easily overlooked because it was customary to con-

trast their method of presentation with their method of investigation. This distinction is to be sure already out of date. Our modern Ricardos and Marxian conquerors generally have the greatest anxiety to put every exception, every observation at once upon paper *urbi et orbi* to announce it, and then afterwards to think it over and decide what their great discovery actually signifies. The method of investigation and of presentation are so concealed that one can scarcely speak of method at all. Just as many a modern merchant keeps his entire stock in the show case so many a modern economist places all the facts at his disposal in his writings. That an abstract presentation can be based upon an immense mass of facts appears unthinkable to these representatives of modern science. An abstract presentation is, according to them, a presentation drawn from the fingers' ends, speculation in thin air.

Just as the historical school in spite of the fact that they indicate a theoretical retrogression toward Ricardo can easily enrich science by valuable individual investigations, so can the revisionists, even if they do indicate a theoretical retrogression in regard to Marx, still further the progressive development of social insight in so far as it is able to fulfill the demands of an individual scientific tendency and does not become a mere restoration of the worship of that vulgar sentimental socialisms, which in the 70's still dominated the whole socialist movement only to give way to Marxism and thereby to become exterminated until this last crisis of Marxism gave it courage to once more come into the light and to pose as a conqueror.

Revisionism can really bring scientifically valuable results to light if they become conscious of the bounds of their ability and like the historical school lay the emphasis upon the description of developments and results. So, for example, to instance only two: the Webbs, by their "History of English Trade Unionism," and Tugan Baranowsky, by his "History of the Russian Factory," have certainly produced significant scientific results and perceptibly widened our social view point.

Whenever revisionism dares to enter the theoretic field, whether it be critical, or an attempt at positive development, it is always shattered, because it is no new comprehensive and uniform theory, but only a single existing tendency in socialism and Marxism.

But if the revisionism is to be continuously distinguished from the historical school in order that it shall stand upon proletarian and not upon bourgeois ground, it is continually forced to enter the field of theory and therein lies one of its weakest sides. A rising class, which cannot come to its full justification and free development in the scope of the society in which it grows,

is forced as soon as it comes to a self-consciousness to set up in place of the existing social form another form corresponding to its interests. It cannot, however, do this without developing a theory of all society. The character of this theory depends upon the condition of the universal and of their particular knowledge. It can under certain conditions be very naive and yet fulfill its historical role. But it must always be compatible with the universally recognized scientific views and must comprehend the totality of society. So it was that the bourgeoisie when they had come to a self-consciousness and would form society, according to their interest were compelled to formulate a comprehensive social theory and they did this in the economy of the Physiocrats and in the school of Smith and Ricardo. This theoretical necessity disappeared as soon as they had attained to rulership and no more sought to change the whole of society, but rather sought to conserve this in order to improve it in certain special cases.

From this on the historical school was the corresponding expression of their scientific need. Its appearance was not an accident. Whatever was possible of continuance in the bourgeoisie can occur in the class condition of the proletariat, only under special local or temporary conditions. Such, for example, as existed in England during the last decade for the economically organized portion of the proletariat, or for period from 1896 to 1900 predominated in the proletariat of the whole world. The proletariat cannot obtain that social freedom and equality, which it demands in the present society. It must also as a rule stand in a condition of enmity to the ruling society and must, accordingly aim to transform the whole society; that is to say it must be revolutionary. The proletariat, accordingly, demands a uniform, comprehensive theory of the whole of society upon which it can base its efforts for the transformation of the whole of society.

So long as the classic bourgeois economy dominated, the proletariat could accept this social theory in so far as it corresponded to its needs. To-day it is only the scientific socialism, that is, a theory of society proceeding from the proletarian standpoint and based upon scientific investigation of society, which the revolutionary proletariat needs.

The theoretical necessity, which has died out in the bourgeoisie since it became conservative, is in the proletariat by the very condition of its class continuously renewed. It cannot continuously satisfy itself, therefore, with a mere translation of the historical school into proletarian phraseology as the revisionists seek to do. On the other hand, this manner of thought of the historical school drawn from the conservative attitudes of its representatives (the word conservative is used in the social, not

the political, sense) leads to a denial of every comprehensive renovation of society and a division of interests into individual reforms and individual effort. So it is that revisionism if it develops to become of any consequence, that is, if it is to remain capable of any action whatever will be brought in conflict with the revolutionary socialist movement. But it will also, if it is to remain true to socialism, be continuously compelled to turn to the great question of social theory and so to come back again and again, whether it will or not, to the boundary line of Marxism, if it is not to become confused with bourgeois liberalism. For, as we have already said, it cannot find another theory of scientific socialism.

Whoever believes that he can set forth a higher theory may do it—but this is only possible to a giant intellect. It was one of the greatest acts of the human mind when socialism was brought forth.

Up to the present time there is not even an embryo of this giant intellect visible. But the views and contributions of the historical school are incapable of either revising, developing or rooting out Marxism. It is not so simple as that. Revisionism can just as little destroy Marxism theoretically, as opportunism can destroy it practically. It has made an end, however, of the fashionable Marxism; over that, however, we will shed no tears. The vital strength of the conquering and advancing Marxism, accordingly has been guarded through its third crisis as gloriously as in both the first.

To-day, twenty years after the death of our great master, the light that he has shed upon the essence of human, and especially of bourgeois society, shows itself more than ever as a guiding star, which we follow as showing to us the least painful way to the great final goal, the emancipation of the proletariat and therewith the redemption of mankind from the curse of capitalism.

Translated from the Neue Zeit by A. M. Simons.

Notes from Australia.

ALTHOUGH Australia is yet a long way behind the older countries in industrial development the same problems which are pressing for solution elsewhere are to be met with here. At present the Unemployed question is causing wide-spread anxiety among the working-classes. An idea of the position may be gathered from the utterance of a speaker at a meeting of unemployed in Melbourne recently. He said: "They would have another Trafalgar Square in Melbourne just to show that they were not going to die of starvation. Men who were drawing £900 a year could not feel for the unemployed; they looked upon men out of work as belonging to an inferior class. . . . What were the workers to do—lie down and rot? They would be fools if they did. It would be better to die fighting than starving."

The existence of the unemployed is simply ignored by the State Parliaments, which are merely committees run in the interests of the capitalists and which devote themselves to making concessions to the pastoralists, to mining syndicates, or to other private enterprises.

The Pastoralists, however, have endeavored to turn the present crisis to their own advantage by attempting to entrap the bush workers into a bogus union, called The Machine Shearers' Union. The real object of this new union is to exterminate the Australian Workers' Union. The A. W. U. entered a protest against the registration of this new union in New South Wales, but the Machine Shearers' Union with only a mere handful of members was able to face an expensive law case and has been registered. The fundamental principle of this union, says its secretary, is that it is not now nor at any time going to be a political organization. It must be kept strictly non-political. It is now making vigorous efforts to extend its sphere of action beyond New South Wales, but there is no serious danger of this union spreading among the bush workers, as they are the backbone of the Political Labor Movement.

At a recent conference of unions a scheme has been suggested for the federation of all the unions in Australia. It is too early to say what will come of this proposal, but it must be welcomed as a sign that the workers in the various states recognize the identity of the interests of labor wherever it is. It is to be lamented, however, that the majority of the unionists in Australia are more interested in gaining a few extra shillings a week than in trying to alter their economic position. In the capitals of each of

the states are socialist organizations, whose immediate duty is to convert the unions to socialism. Recently Tom Mann has been appointed organizer for the Victorian unions. In a pamphlet entitled, *The Labor Movement of Both Hemispheres*, recently written by him, he says: "There is no cure for this pitiable state of affairs short of public ownership of mine and minerals, public ownership of land and machinery and public control of industry in the interests of all alike."

Andrew M. Anderson.

The Rural Exodus.*



ALL over the world Socialists are studying the problem of the farmer. No one has done more exhaustive work in this field than Emile Vandervelde. This monograph on a single phase of the subject is filled with extremely valuable material.

He begins by showing that the rural exodus has been an invariable accompaniment of capitalism. Statistics are given for all the principal European and American cities, showing everywhere a continuous movement from the country toward the city. In some countries this movement is so rapid that there is a positive decrease of population in the country districts, but in most countries there is simply a more rapid growth of the urban population.

Agricultural laborers are growing constantly fewer in all countries where capitalism is established. "Even in the United States, where the total agricultural population is increasing, the number of agricultural workers tends to diminish." In 1880 there were 3,323,876 agricultural laborers in the United States, and in 1890 this number had decreased over 300,000. In Germany and in France there is a similar movement, while in England it has proceeded much further than in any other country.

In the second chapter he considers the causes of the rural exodus and mentions three factors: First, the attraction of the cities; second, the ease of transport; third, over-population of the country. None of these are very definite and the classification offers considerable ground for criticism. The first two he at once admits are insufficient to account for any great movement, and are really but superficial names for deeper forces. "The thing which renders the exodus absolutely necessary is the relative over-population of the country, making it impossible to find means of existence and compelling the rural dwellers to search for the means of living in other places."

Nothing is more characteristic of the farmer than the obstinacy with which he clings to the corner of earth upon which he has always lived, and when such a great portion of the rural population move towards the city it indicates a powerful compelling force. Another reason which is of greater importance in Europe than in America, although not wholly lacking in some parts of this country, especially in New England, is the division of the common land. A fundamental

*L'Exode Rural et le Retour aux Champs, by Emile Vandervelde; Felix Alcan, Paris, Publisher. Cloth, 304 pp., 8 francs.

cause of the rural exodus is found in the separation of industry from agriculture. Weaving, iron working, and the linen industry are a few of those which were formerly performed by the tillers of the soil, but which have now moved to the great industrial centers. Another cause on which he lays considerable importance is the agricultural crisis which was brought about in Europe between 1846 and 1875 by the fall in the price of grain due to American and Russian competition. The extensive introduction of machinery in agriculture and the use of pasturage instead of cultivated land has made a large number of laborers unnecessary. The seasonal character of agriculture renders labor uncertain and adds another cause. In this chapter, although he mentions as noted above the moving of many industries from the country, he does not seem to give anywhere near the importance which is due to the fact that a continuously increasing number of industries, which originated on the farm, are moving toward the city. Such for example have been the killing and preparation of meat and the preparation of dairy products.

The third chapter on the "Forms of the Rural Exodus" is one of the most exhaustive and valuable portions of the book. He points out that this may be divided into the permanent and seasonal emigration and studies at great length the various phases of these three movements. He shows the effect of the daily exodus on city wages, the part played by low railroad fares, and the inhumanly long hours the daily journey of many miles entails upon these workers.

The fourth chapter discusses the consequence of the rural exodus. The subject is viewed from the point of view of the workers, and he concludes that in spite of the fact of the long hours and many disadvantages under which the rural laborer works, he nevertheless improves his condition when he comes to the city. He is brought in touch with a wider world and is given a broader outlook and as a general thing receives a higher wage than was paid upon the farm. The farmers consider this movement of the workers as decidedly to their disadvantage, as it brings a new competitor into the market for the purchase of labor power and as a consequence they generally oppose the "workman's trains" and the whole movement away from the country. From the point of view of the collectivity he finds that the Socialists at least have every reason to look with favor upon this movement.

The men who are brought in from the country become messengers of Socialism to their own neighborhoods. They become permeated with a class consciousness and afford the best means of reaching an otherwise almost inaccessible section of population. Everywhere physically and morally he considers that there is not near as much to be said against the movement to the city as is

commonly supposed at the present time. It is undoubtedly true as he points out that the conditions of housing and general living of the city proletariat is much more unsatisfactory than it might be in the country, yet this is something capable of alteration and scarce outweighs the other advantages.

The second part of the book is entitled "The Return to the Fields," and covers a subject which has hitherto been much neglected. "The one essential characteristic of modern times and particularly of the nineteenth century, is centralization; political centralization through the formation of the bourgeois state and the establishment of nationalities; economic centralization through the concentration of capital and labor power; finally, as a necessary consequence of these, urban centralization, through the multiplication of great cities, the centers of industry and government." Nevertheless "Counter currents are manifest in the opinion of many thinkers as well as in the practice of business men."

The central portion of many cities shows a decrease in population; business blocks and office buildings driving the former dwellers toward the outskirts. He finds that the great increase in population which many of the cities show, arises from the settling up of the suburban portion often by people who are moving from the city itself. "Naturally a movement of this sort increases as the means of transport are improved. . . . In short, after having been one of the principal causes of the desertion of the country by disassociating industry from agriculture, by giving rise to the agricultural crisis and rendering the rural exodus more easy, the development of means of communication and transport have now produced a contrary effect by favoring the industrialization of agriculture, the creation of industrial establishments in the country, and the temporary or complete exodus of city dwellers to the open country."

The industrialization of agriculture shows itself in the organization of the milk trade and the handling of vegetables which were formerly brought in by the growers themselves, but which now require great commercial and industrial organizations for their handling. It is remarkable that the author who is ordinarily so familiar with American conditions did not note the fact that this movement had developed much further in the United States than in any of the countries he describes. This is especially remarkable in view of the fact that information on this point is so easily accessible, it having been worked out and summarized by the Industrial Commission.

Market gardening is another instance of the industrialization of agriculture which is tending to create a population midway between city and country life. Such industries located close to the

cities avoid many of the difficulties of the labor supply which affects agriculture proper. In this connection it is noteworthy that many manufacturing firms have moved into suburban locations partially to avoid trades unions and the high rent of urban locations. The utilization of electricity will probably extend this movement. We are inclined to think, however, that Vandervelde exaggerates this point, and the illustrations that he draws from the United States are by no means wholly reliable. He concludes that "On the whole there are serious reasons for thinking that we have arrived at a turning point in industrial evolution from the point of view of geographical distribution of undertakings."

Considerable time is devoted to the various phases of this movement towards the country, and also to the discussion of various plans for the building of villages having the advantages of both city and country. He recognizes, however, that no rational distribution of the population is possible so long as capitalism remains and profit is the social motive force.

A. M. Simons.

Discharged.



NOT charged with crime—no, no!
Not charged with guilt in e'en a slight degree—no, no!
Not charged with gross incompetence or carelessness or
shirking toil or answering back when he was or-
dered here and there—

No, no!

Discharged. That's all.

I stood and watched my Brother when that fateful word was flung
at him.

I saw the pallor of his poorly nourished skin and flesh fade to the
likeness of a corpse.

I looked to see him smite the sender of that damned, death-deal-
ing word who'd lived and thrived and piled up wealth (and
squandered it like dirt) through all the fruitful fat and gra-
cious years, from toil of his,—full in the face, and then de-
mand his share.

I looked to see my Brothers, Comrades, Friends, arise and rally
to his side and keep that crushing word from casting its
blood-curdling terror through the heart of wife and child he
loves.

I looked to see the brutal thief that banished him from bread,
that had betrayed him into useless, needless toil, that had de-
prived him of a chance to be what Brothers all should be, in
haste retreat to land where kings have gilt-trapped slaves
trained to destroy who doubts the right of man to steal—*so he
steals legally, or bribes the judge.*

I looked, and looked!

I looked in vain.

As meekly as a snake-charmed dove submits, and far more unre-
sistingly than sheep yield to the butcher's hand, he turned
aside—and hid his tears, and gulped his hot resentment down.

I followed far behind and bared my head when he had entered
home of his and theirs and faced the fear and terror his en-
slaver ne'er had dared to face.

I heard the awful cry from woman's love-kissed lips—

“NOT OUT OF WORK! GREAT GOD, WHAT SHALL
WE DO.”

No work had I for these skilled hands—else had I shared with
him.

But I have given this:—

I have confronted his enslaver with the cry of THIEF.

I have tapped lightly and with love upon my Comrade's door
and entering clasped his hand and spoken words to him—and
I have seen answering light leap in his eyes that made his
wife and children smile.

And I have broken bread with him and tasted salt while leaning
far across his sparse-laid board, while I was sending courage
to his heart and speaking words of Peace, God's peace: *as-*
serting Right's uprising, instant, swift, and stern: to his re-
ceptive brain—and all the while his wife and children smiles,
for hope of Freedom's dawn.

* * * * *

*Rejoice, O Wife, your husband will not let you starve while kings
have plenty and while queens toil not!*

*Rejoice, O Children, for your father kind and just will never let
you want while rich retain one penny he has earned!*

Rejoice, O Men! A slave was slain with words this day!

Rejoice, O Earth! Your child was born anew this day—

Behold, he is a MAN!

* * * * *

“Discharged!”

Now may the Power that made this earth and man demand of
you, O sleek enslaver of my Brother's wife and child (I say
naught of himself: he is a man and should bear no man's
word “Discharged”) by what right, warrant or permission
you have uttered such a word to man!

Sure, there are some that dare denounce that word as but a mur-
derer's cudgel dashing more than flesh and blood and life to
earth, and wielded by a coward through another's hand.

“But words are wind,” my murderer sneers, “and who indeed
are they that hurl such words at me?”

But words are wind, and wind is breath, and breath is life; and
Poet's words are vital words for slaves, and death-charged
words that win their way to the enslaver's ear, demanding in
the name of Power above, of Power that still abides in slaves,
of Power that stirs at sight of quivering lips of worker's
wives and tears in their loved children's eyes, demanding
and demanding and *demanding*, by what thieved warrant,
right, permission, you, *a man*, while wealth was in your hand,
have dared to say

DISCHARGED.

Edwin A. Brenholtz.

Tolstoi and Socialism.

IN the St. Louis Republic of Nov. 30th was an article, copyrighted by W. R. Hearst, under the title of "A Return to Nature," by Count Leo Tolstoi, in which the great Russian author appears as an enemy of Socialism.

It is hard to believe that an article so full of self-evident contradictions and so deficient in logical conclusions could have come from this great writer's pen.

The article starts well with the following:

"The fact that you workingmen are forced to pass your life in poverty, not to say misery; that you are condemned to the hardest kind of work that does not benefit, while other people who do not work at all reap the profits of your work—the fact that many of you are practically slaves of these people, and the fact that this is unjust, must be clear to anyone who has a heart and eyes to see with. But what is to be done to change this?"

He then advocates what he calls a return to nature, where every man becomes attached to the soil and individually or as a family produces everything he needs.

This is a condition of primitive barbarism which no one questions his right to advocate, but in the following references to Socialism he shows a surprising ignorance of the simplest conditions of Socialism.

I quote at length: "When all men have been deprived of the ground they possess, when they shall have become factory hands . . . then the time will come when they shall own in full all the lands and all the factories. One would think that a doctrine like this (Socialism) that asks the workingman, living and working in free, open air, occupied in good healthy farming work, to give up his free wholesome life close to nature's bosom and move into the noise and impure atmosphere of the city, to work like a machine at monotonous work in a factory, and to live in filthy, squalid tenement lodgings that will drive the color out of the cheeks of his children, would not have much chance of success among thoughtful men who, working their natural soil, are not used to being slaves, as the workers in a modern factory practically are. And still this doctrine which is called Socialism is gaining rapidly even in a country like Russia, where 98 per cent of the workingmen are still occupied at farm work."

In the first statement he assumes that the people are deprived of the ground they possess and then become full owners

of all the land as well as all the factories. Then, if the people become full owners of the land, what right has he to assume that they will be asked to give it up and move into impure cities, monotonous factories and filthy and squalid tenements, as he pictures in the following sentence? What right has he to assume that when the people own and operate the factories they will be as he pictures? If the people own them will they not transform them so that they can enjoy them and eliminate all the disagreeable features? He conceives of an entire change in society, its usages and customs, yet he leaves the cities and factories unchanged. He removes the sewer that befouls the stream, but cannot see that the stream is changed. How can he conceive of the cities filled with noisome factories and filthy and squalid tenements when the capitalist owners have been eliminated from our industrial activities and the people own their own homes?

He says further: "Land is all that is worth fighting for, all that is necessary to enable a man to make a living; and still the Socialist leaders say nothing about the land, or at least its importance is placed second to that of owning the factories. . . . The laboring masses must demand the land that is now owned by the few, they must demand it of their governments, not as a favor, but as a right, for the reason that all land should belong to those who will work it—and not to a class of useless drones."

Is it possible that Leo Tolstoi can be so ignorant of Socialism as not to know that the common ownership of land is the first and fundamental proposition of Socialism? Whether or not agriculture and its affiliated industries would be carried on collectively under Socialism or the use of the land given to individuals under a lease of use, no Socialist questions the necessity of the collective ownership of all lands. It would seem that the great Russian has formed a perverted conception of Socialism or the capitalistic press of this country has put false words upon his pen.

W. L. Garner.

Chillicothe, Mo.

EDITORIAL

Our Real Antagonist.

It has been quite the fashion among Socialists to hold out W. R. Hearst as the "bogey man" who was sure to get us if we didn't watch out. The great and overwhelming danger of the Socialist party was held to consist in the possibility of "sidetracking" the Socialist movement by the growth of the Hearst and Bryan Democracy. We plead guilty of having shared in this fear for some time, but we are now firmly convinced that the heavy Socialist artillery turned in that direction wasted a lot of ammunition that was greatly needed at other points. The radical democracy is really something that has had its day. It has become comparatively helpless, hopeless and harmless. In this respect it is but a reflection of the economic class of which it is composed. The small bourgeois have always been a weak, vacillating class. This class by the very fact of the conflicting interests which arise from the divergent interests of its members, and the constantly changing makeup of its personality has never been able to play any important part in history for any great length of time.

Hearst has endeavored to hitch its fortunes to the chariot of Labor by his famous editorial on "Democracy, Labor's Natural Ally," but it appeared too late to be of any avail. Had this editorial been written immediately after the Presidential election of 1900 and had he been supported in this position by Bryan and the Populist wing of the party in an active campaign for the enactment of reform legislation it is quite probable that this movement would have reached sufficient proportions to have been of great importance. Had a fortunate panic come along it might even have landed one of its leaders in the Presidential chair, and effectively blanketed the sails of the Socialist ship for some years to come. But to have supposed such a thing is to grant to the small capitalist class a social insight and a political initiative which is absolutely foreign to its nature. Now that it has moved it is weak and uncertain, torn by conflicting interests and incapable of any decisive action.

The small capitalists of the North, being largely made up from the trading class, since the ousting of the small manufacturers by the trusts, are beginning to feel themselves dependent upon the increased purchasing power of the workers and so are quite ready to fall in with Hearst's support of "trade unions" and national ownership of railroads. They hope to use the trade unions both in the economic and

political field as a means of smashing the trusts and thus re-establish the little exploiter upon the backs of the workers.

In the South the small capitalist class is largely composed of those who are just beginning to establish manufactories and is hostile to all forms of labor legislation or labor organization. It is worthy of note that neither of the Hearst papers nor Bryan's "Commoner" have dared to take any very open stand on the question of child labor.

But the movement, such as it is, is already disintegrated. It is an open secret that the Cleveland-Olney wing are in control of the political machinery of the Democratic party. This is as the great capitalists would have it. With Cleveland or some one of similar political views nominated in opposition to Roosevelt we should have a practical coalition of the forces of plutocracy against the rising Socialist movement, and this is what appearances indicate that we shall see.

Hence it is that we believe that the real danger to proletarian advance and the real opponent of the Socialist party must be sought elsewhere, even for the present moment, than in the ranks of radical democracy. The opponents of Socialism have but two ways to fight it: open hostility and secret bribery. The radical democracy can offer nothing in the way of bribes, and open hostility on its part would be simply laughable.

In the Hanna movement within the Republican party, however, we have all the elements from which may be developed a Bismarckian policy in America that shall have infinitely greater strength than Bismarck was able to command. It will be stronger and more clever if allowed to develop than its German prototype, because of the fact that it will apparently originate and remain in close connection with the labor organizations themselves. The Civic Federation offers a most effective means of hoodwinking the workers into believing that they are securing advantages through their own exertions; always a much more gratifying point of view than to think that these slight advantages are granted as favors from some benevolent despot. Mark Hanna, or some similar statesman, can pose as the friend of labor and apparently assist them in making trifling gains. He can cajole the labor fakir and deceive the ignorant labor leader much more successfully than Hearst since the latter can offer only words while Hanna can occasionally produce real though small results. He can offer political plums to those whose fakirdom has become too evident or who are particularly favored as stool pigeons. Examples of this will occur to everyone in the recent appointments of Madden, Arthur, Clarke, et al. The Republican party is in power. It is the organ of the real social and economic rulers of America. These rulers can therefore actually grant a slight amelioration which the Democratic party can only promise. Meanwhile Roosevelt can pose as a strenuous enemy of the trust and catch those who are still foolish enough to believe in trust-smashing.

In this connection the public press seems to have forgotten all about the great results that were to follow the Northern Securities decision. When this decision was announced all the newspapers proclaimed that it was the deathblow of the trust, but up to the present time we have not heard that even the particular company against

which it was aimed has been affected and indeed we will venture to say that the only way that any of them have been touched is the way in which politicians usually touch the great capitalists, i. e., for larger contributions to the campaign fund.

Incidentally it is worth while to call attention to a fact in this connection which seems to have escaped the Socialist press. The lawyer who assisted Attorney General Knox in the Northern Securities case, the moment the decision was made, took a position with a firm of lawyers in New York City which handles most of J. P. Morgan's business.

But to return. In our opinion, a truthful forecast of political events would run something as follows: The rapid disintegration of the Bryan Democracy and the drifting of a considerable portion of its membership into the Socialist party, the practical coalition of the Republican and Democratic party by the nomination of candidates standing for the same principles in opposition to the Socialist party. The Democratic candidate being a pure dummy, we would be little interested in him. The Republican party could hold out Hanna as the gloved hand with which to pet and coddle and mollify the laboring class while they were being led to the slaughter, and Roosevelt would pose as the mailed fist apparently preparing to deal death and destruction to the trusts, but really organizing a national guard and distributing riot bullets, Gatling guns and other paraphernalia for the slaughter of workmen should they not be sufficiently deceived by the Hanna policy.

This number of The Review ends our third volume. With our next number we shall greatly improve the typographical appearance and general character. The July number will contain several very important articles. Among these will be a reply by Mrs. May Wood Simons to the articles which appeared in the May number criticising the materialistic interpretation of history. There will also be a translation of an important article by Achille Loria on the same subject, and the editor will have an article on the economic aspects of chattel slavery in the United States, which will bring out many points on this question never previously published.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Some of those labor officials who have quoted Mr. Herman Justi approvingly for advising employers to organize, with the expectation that the bosses' associations would treat with the unions, are having their hopes partly fulfilled. That is, the capitalists are getting together rapidly enough—in fact, there is a veritable organization boom on among them—but as they begin to realize the power of their combinations they seem to grow more autocratic and are disinclined to conciliate and arbitrate. In New York, for example, a \$500,000,000 combine of employers has been formed, and its slogan is "The Walking Delegate Must Go!" In Omaha the whole town was torn up with strikes and lockouts, all due to the fact that the organized bosses refused to listen to arbitration. In Kansas City the bosses united and declared opposition to all concerns that discriminated against unorganized labor and non-union products. In Chicago they are organizing along the lines of trade unions. In Connecticut the building contractors combined and introduced a reference card and secret code, and insisted that all workers must carry such card. In Pittsburg the employers are uniting to run their own business and resist the tyranny of trade unions, etc.; and in scores of other places, large and small, the same thing is occurring. And still Hanna says Parryism does not represent the views and acts of American capitalists. But the wily Senator may have a few irons in the fire. The fact remains that the capitalists are combining, and it is only a question of time when the final struggle for mastery between the two classes will commence and be fought to a finish. That it will be political and economic no person of sound sense will attempt to deny at this late day. Far-seeing capitalists themselves admit it and are preparing. Labor must do like wise or lose.

The Canadian capitalists are not disguising the fact that they are organizing to destroy the unions. A powerful association of bosses has been formed in Toronto and branches are being started all over the Dominion. They have become so aggressive that a serious attempt is being made to sever the Canadian unions from those of the United States, and a bill is now being pushed in Parliament, which provides that any alien who urges men to strike in Canada may be imprisoned for two years. The bosses are also attempting to cripple the union label, while the Taff Vale method of confiscating union treasuries has been introduced, the woodworkers having been fined \$100 and costs for engaging in a strike in Berlin, Ont. The new Brotherhood of Railway Employers (which is modeled after the plan of the old A. R. U.

and includes all classes of railway workers) has been making such rapid headway on the other side of the line that the Canadian Pacific officials are reported to have announced that they will spend \$5,000,000 to crush the organization. All these incidents are tending to awaken the Canadian workingmen to the necessity of taking independent political action, and Socialism is making splendid gains.

An Indiana District Court has ruled that trade unions may be sued for damages caused by strike or boycott, probably taking the cue from the outcome of the case in Rutland, Vt., where the machinists were mulcted in the sum of \$2,500 damages. Several printing firms in Chicago quickly took the hint and sued the bookbinders for a total of \$35,000 damages, and in Adams, Mass., a butcher also wants unions that have boycotted him to pay for their acts. The Dayton damage cases are still in court, as are those in New York.

Another bitter jurisdiction fight in the labor world has been settled by the amalgamation of the two national sheet metal workers' unions in their joint conventions in Milwaukee. The struggle between these two bodies for mastery became so fierce that personal assaults took place in a number of cities, and the factions denounced and worked against each other everywhere. But now extreme hatred has given way to extreme enthusiasm, and the rank and file are awakened to a full understanding of the benefits of thorough unionism as against factional wars. The trouble between the carpenters' brotherhood and the amalgamated men culminated in a big strike in New York, where 10,000 members of the brotherhood struck against working with the "mals." The brotherhood has also made an agreement with cabinet manufacturers of New York, which means a widening of the breach between them and the woodworkers. The machinists, at their recent convention in Milwaukee, seem to have changed their policy and joined the "industrialists" by the adoption of a resolution claiming jurisdiction over all employes in a machine shop. This action will bring them into conflict with the allied metal mechanics, who claimed the right to organize helpers, laborers, etc. The long-pending controversy between the brewery workers and the engineers and firemen seems no nearer settlement. The molders have also spread out and effected an amalgamation with the coremakers and will organize the foundry laborers. The waiters have again decided to claim jurisdiction over sea cooks, waiters, etc., and the clash with the seamen will continue, and the longshoremen are steadily pushing ahead and absorbing all classes of workers along and upon waterways. The tailors are again voting upon the question of admitting special order workers and thus cutting into the garment workers. And the end is not yet.

A nice state of affairs, which thoroughly illustrates the viciousness of government by injunction, exists in California. The mill and smelter and mine workers of Keswick have been making a hard fight against the Mountain Copper Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Great Britain. The men were in a fair way of winning when the corporation enticed them back to work with the promise of arbitrating all differences. The men returned, but the

bosses deliberately broke their promises. Thereupon the workers struck a second time and the company imported scabs from wherever they could be found. However, the strikers were again securing the upper hand in the struggle, when the corporation played its trump card in the shape of an injunction from a Federal Court. So here we have a foreign corporation lording it over and bringing hardship and suffering to American citizens. Still the politicians talk about "America for Americans" and "Americanizing the unions!"

Hats off to the Hebrew printers of New York. They lead the procession. They have established themselves on a four-hour workday basis with wages at \$15 per week. This is the maximum labor time that the advocates of Socialism declare is necessary, but by no means the maximum wage rate, and there are a goodly number of believers in Socialistic doctrine among the New York Hebrew printers, and they are putting their theory into practice.

Mr. John Hobson, the well-known British economist, has been traveling through the country recently investigating the trust question, in which he is deeply interested, and delivering lectures in the principal cities. He has written several books dealing with labor questions, and enjoys the fullest confidence and respect of the unionists on the other side of the Atlantic. He is of the opinion that industrial affairs in America are rapidly reaching a crisis, and marvels at the immense power of the Rockefeller and Morgan capitalists who control wealth from raw material to finished product laid upon the market. He realizes that such a condition cannot endure and predicts that America will go to a Socialistic basis before any other country. "Organized labor in Great Britain," said Mr. Hobson, in discussing interesting subjects with the writer, "is confronted by several grave problems. The unemployed question is assuming tremendous proportions and there is much distress among the workers who are in enforced idleness. Then the court decisions have thrown our unionists into a state of chaos. The Taff Vale decision came like a thunder clap from a clear sky, and to-day none of the funds of our labor organizations are safe, for any employer or any blackleg can go into court and tie up the money of a union and likely secure damages. Heretofore we have been very conservative, but now an effort is being made to combine the unions and the Socialist parties for the purpose of gaining political control. You may have noticed the election recently held in the Woolrich district, where Will Crooks, the Labor candidate, was sent to Parliament, taking the seat formerly held by Sir Charles Beresford, Conservative. There is no doubt in my mind but the combined labor forces will elect at least forty men at the next general elections, which will be on soon. Labor in England is learning that its only hope is to gain possession of the government."

The trusts are playing a new game. In Astoria, Ore., a big packing company announced that it would unionize its plant and employ only white labor in its cannery. The manager of the tin can trust thereupon notified the packing company that if only union labor was employed no more cans would be sold to the Astoria concern, but if Chinese and non-union labor were employed the company could have all

the cans desired. In Omaha the employers' association withheld supplies from a concern that unionized its establishment and was injunctioned for so doing, and the matter is now in the courts. If the trusts and capitalistic associations generally make this sort of a stand it develops a new question that must be faced, and a very serious one at that. Class lines are being sharply drawn these days.

The anti-trust agitation is striking home. It will be recalled that it was stated in the Review recently that a court in Iowa had declared a teamsters' union illegal and in conflict with the anti-trust law. Then the Texas Legislature enacted a so-called anti-trust law which, according to the best constitutional attorneys in that State, can be enforced against trade unions. But the Republican politicians of New Hampshire have gone their Bourbon brethren of the Lone Star State one better and adopted a constitutional amendment and then based a law upon it, according to which labor organizations can be dissolved for interfering with "free and fair competition." In Texas 100,000 workingmen petitioned the powers that be to re-enact a law legalizing unions or pass a bill declaring that labor organizations are excepted in the provisions of the anti-trust law, but they were snubbed, the governor declaring that he is "the workingman's friend," and they have nothing to fear. In New Hampshire the unions have also used up a lot of ink and paper in resolving against the politicians whom they elected, but the latter are saying nothing and putting in their time framing pretty speeches to feed workers during the next campaign. It might be added that the corrupt politicians in the Virginia Legislature are considering a bill to make it a misdemeanor for unions to persuade non-union men or scabs to leave their employment, and the "workingmen's friends" of North Carolina have steered a bill through one branch of the Legislature to fine and imprison employers for locking out employes or the latter to call a strike. And so the grind continues and the patient workers are paying dearly for their neglect in guarding their political power and "throwing it away" on capitalistic tools.

The courts seem to be working overtime in their pleasant occupation of killing labor laws, so-called. The Indiana Supreme Court, at one fell swoop, smashed the law for which the unionists of that State worked like Trojans, and spent considerable money to secure its passage, namely, the measure fixing a minimum wage for laborers on all public work. The court declared that the law was "paternalism" and "injured" labor. Having disposed of that law, the same court took up the law requiring weekly payment of wages and declared it unconstitutional. That law was also "paternalism" and "injured labor." The wise men held that labor is property and exchangeable for food and raiment and "some" comforts, and that "if the master can employ only upon terms of weekly payment the workman can find employment on no other terms." Of course, the "masters" are weeping bitter tears of disappointment because the court rescued the downtrodden from their clutches. The Illinois Supreme Court, with one swipe, smashed the law creating free employment bureaus, and now there is loud denunciation of the court, but the court don't care. In New York the

highest court in the State knocked out the minimum, or "fair rate," law some time ago, and now follows it up with a decision that destroys the best measure on the statute books—the eight-hour law. This law has run the gauntlet in New York for over a year, and the "tax-payers" were loud in denunciation of the "special privileges" that it conferred, just as the same kidney were in Ohio, when they had the eight-hour law in that State declared unconstitutional. The eight-hour and minimum wage laws are really the only labor laws worth fighting for, and now that they are dead and buried in many of the States it looks as though the unions will gain nothing unless they cease begging and place their own class-conscious men in the Legislatures and on the bench to enact and interpret laws.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

France.

Recent events in the world of Socialism in France is of extreme interest as throwing a light on the tendency in regard to tactics. When about two years ago the Socialist movement in France was split into two hostile parties the natural inference would be that the opportunists or the Millerand wing would grow continuously more and more bourgeois in its sympathies. It was formed of those who were specifically pledged to the support of the ministerialist position, yet it was only a short time until the proletarian instinct began to assert itself, and to revolt against the tactics which were compromising its class interests. So it was that at the recent congress at Bordeaux there were a large number of local divisions of the party who came there instructed to expell Millerand who but a short time before had been designated the "undisputed" leader by Hubert de Lagardelle. Millerand had taken the position that he was responsible only to those who elected him and not to the whole Socialist party. This well-known little bourgeois position at once aroused rebellion. Then when he showed a weakness in his hostility to militarism and clericalism and in numerous ways rejected the proletarian position the number of his antagonists increased rapidly, so that when it came to the congress recently held at Bordeaux 51 out of 122 votes were in favor of expelling him from the party which was practically organized to carry out his policy.

A large number who did not feel willing to go to the length of expelling him were out of sympathy with his position so that a resolution of censure was adopted by a vote of 72 to 52. Even Jaures is showing signs of breaking with Millerand and recent numbers of *La Petite Republique* are filled with controversial articles between these hitherto inseparable political friends. According to an article by Jean Longuet in a recent number of *Neue Zeit* this action indicates the downfall of the Opportunist wing of French Socialism.

Some of the leading European Socialists, however, regard the same facts from exactly the opposite point of view from that of Longuet. Lagardelle declares that "the adversaries of Millerand are directing their blows simply against isolated facts which had violently aroused the anti-clerical and anti-ministerialists ideas of the mass of the militant workers and permit the general theory of reformist opportunism to be put absolutely to one side." As a result of this he declares that

the congress at Bordeaux has given rise to the formation of a definitely reform party.

B. Kitschewsky in an article in a later number of the *Neue Zeit* agrees in many ways with Lagardelle. He considers that the disagreement between Jaures and Millerand to be a sham one. He also thinks that the resolution of censure being directed towards specific acts rather than the general principles of ministerialism was of little importance. This writer criticised quite sharply the lack of clearness in the Socialist philosophy of even the antagonists of Millerand. He thinks that the outcome of the congress must be, however, a split in the party which has hitherto supported Millerand and that those who leave the Millerand movement will constitute an addition to the actually revolutionary movement in France.

Edouard Vaillant in London "*Justice*" agrees that the Bordeaux Congress means the formation of a purely reform party and says:

"We could not wish for anything better than the formation of this party, and prefer that matters should no longer be ambiguous. This is better than revolutionary speeches combined with opportunist politics and a middle-class alliance. There will be more light, and that is what we want."

In consequence of the victory of Millerand many federations who have hitherto been faithful to the Ministerial Socialists now seem likely to leave them. Allemane has proposed a conference to see if there is not some *modus vivendi* possible between anti-ministerial revolutionary Socialists of all sections. The *Parti Socialiste de France* (Guesdists and Blanquists) are in a fair way to attract to themselves all that is really Socialist in France.

Germany.

The Social Democratic members of the Reichstag have issued an appeal to the voters, from which we take the following selections: "When in the spring of 1898 we published our electoral announcements we promised to lead the battle against wrong, oppression and exploitation in every form, and to further in all possible manner the cause of progress. These promises we have faithfully kept.

"We did all that we could to right wrong, abolish violence, hinder exploitation, fight oppression, and serve the cause of progress.

"If we often failed to maintain that which we desired it was due to the smallness of our numbers, which was always opposed by an overwhelming majority.

"Unfortunately, the last five years have given only too few of the advances which we hoped to endorse with our votes, while it has brought much in the way of new burdens and oppressions for the people."

The appeal then goes on to describe the various measures which have come before the Reichstag and the attitude of the Social Democratic members in relation to them: "The continuous growth of the military and naval budget, the enactment of the hunger tariff, and the expenditure of increasing sums in colonial administrations are a few

of the movements in the interest of capitalism which have progressed in spite of the opposition of the Socialist representatives.

"The same parties and classes that continually boast of their patriotism and denounce us as 'Vaterlandless,' refuse absolutely to contribute from their great incomes and properties to the support of the army and navy, but support by their overwhelming numbers as patriotic and just the indirect taxes of all forms which bear most heavily upon the necessary means of living of the poorer classes.

"Voters! on the day the business classes of this kingdom are compelled by income and property taxes to meet the cost of the new army and navy expenses, we are at the end of their endorsement of these expenses. The patriotism of these classes will disappear and thereby they will show how superfluous these things are.

"Even in the individual states, as in the kingdom, financial distress is upon us. They can no longer see their way out. The most pressing tasks of advancing civilization suffer from lack of funds, but for new means of destruction the means are always at hand.

"And how is it with internal politics? The most pressing legal reforms, absolutely necessary social reforms, the extension of protection for laborers, decisive measures for the popular health, etc., are continuously met with the reply that it costs too much and that there is no money. Oppressive laws in relation to the press, unions and public meetings restrict the right of coalition and association of laborers, and infringe upon the personal freedom of citizens as if Germany stood, not upon the highest but upon the lowest stage of civilization.

"There is only one means of remedying all this,—and that is fighting—continuous fighting, against all who are guilty of supporting this unholy economic system, until it is overthrown.

"It is especially the task of the laboring class, which suffer the most beneath all these evils, to support with all their strength the struggle of the Social Democracy against this horrible injustice.

"The women also and especially the working women who, up until the present time are excluded from all political activity, have every reason to work for the success of the candidates of the Social Democracy.

"Even if they cannot vote, they can agitate.

"Election day shall be a day of judgment and of reckoning for those who misuse and abuse you—a day which shall also be a day of triumph from which a new and better future shall be dated.

"Remember that according to the enactment of a reactionary majority in the Reichstag you have an opportunity to go to the ballot box only once in five years.

"How seldom such a day will come into your life. See that you use it. Use it in such a manner that every one of you can say to himself, 'I have done my duty.'

"Our watchword for the election is 'Down with the present form of militarism that is sucking the life of the people.' Peace for the people.

"Down with the accursed taxation and commercial policy which presses upon the life of many men.

"Down with the taxation and tariff policy which oppresses the poor and favors the rich.

"Down with internal reaction, governmental tyranny, police oppression and judicial uncertainty.

"On with the battle for progress in every sphere, for knowledge, for freedom, for release from all the oppression which class domination and class legislation have laid upon the shoulders of the laboring masses of the people.

"Our goal is the bringing in of the Socialist state and a social order founded upon social property in the means of labor with the duty of labor for all its members, and the creation of a political and social condition in which truth, justice and equality and the welfare of all will be the guiding motive of all acts.

"Voters! Those among you who share these views, vote on the 16th of June for the candidates of the Social Democracy."

Holland.

Our readers will remember that the subject of the general strike in Holland was thoroughly treated in our April number. The following quotation from an article by Henri Polak in London "Justice" shows the outcome of the struggle after the anti-strike bill was introduced into Parliament and the deadening effect which the mistaken action has had upon the Socialist movement of Holland.

The Liberal members pronounced themselves in favor of the bills, and the vigorous action of the Social Democratic members could not prevent the rushing of the bills through the House, as the Liberals spoke very little, and the Clerical members not at all! The debate was, therefore, limited to the Social Democrats and the two cabinet ministers in charge of the bills.

After a two days' debate, the passing of the bills was near at hand. And then the Committee of Defense resolved to order a general strike. This was a terrible mistake, and the strike was consequently a dismal failure. At Amsterdam about 25,000 men, principally the diamond workers, the building trades and the engineers, struck. But the rest remained at work. And throughout the country it was even worse. And in the evening of the very day that the general strike was proclaimed, the bills were passed, and the Committee of Defense, seeing the uselessness of any further action, ordered work to be resumed on the following day at noon.

This created a terrible storm. The diamond workers, well organized and disciplined as they are, went back to work at once. But in several other trades the men, under the influence of Anarchist leaders of the Domela Nieuwenhuis type, refused to resume work, and so disbanded, disorganized groups of men remained out for some days, without any use or purpose, without knowing why and wherefore they were doing so.

The result of all this was that hundreds of men were locked out. The railway companies have thrown out no less than 1,600 men. And about 1,000 others, spread over different trades, shared the same fate.

The shipping masters, etc., seized the opportunity, and locked out all their men (about 6,000), and would only take them back on condition that they signed an agreement whereby they had to abandon the principle of collective bargaining and to suffer the weekly deduction of a certain percentage of their wages, until a sum of about four guineas a head was deducted, which is to remain in the hands of the employers, to be forfeited in case of a strike.

The situation can be summed up as follows:

(a) The union of the railway servants (which had a membership of about 13,000) is completely smashed.

(b) The Federation of the Transport Workers is crippled, if not paralyzed, for a long time to come, and will have to face severe struggles ere it regains its former position.

(c) The whole trade union movement has suffered a severe shock, which will make itself felt for years.

(d) The Social Democratic Labor party, which, in its solidarity with the cause of threatened trade unionism, has allowed itself to join the general strike movement, has seriously imperilled its political success for some time to come.

(e) The clerical government has strengthened its position immensely, having gathered under its banner the panic-stricken middle classes of all denominations.

(f) The confessional pseudo trade unions, led and directed by the clergy, have unmistakably gained ground, and will prove a serious obstacle in the way of the trade unions proper.

(g) No progressive movement of the unions can be thought of for some time, as all their energies and their funds have to be expended in supporting the hundreds upon hundreds of destitute families of victims of the strike.

But there are also some shimmerings of light in the darkness around us. The workingmen will now surely turn their backs on the Anarchists and their teachings. The idea of the general strike as a sure means of bringing about the sudden transition of the capitalist production into the Socialist will no longer be popular with the workers of Holland. And our trade unionists *pur et simple*, who would have nothing of political action, have learned a lesson they will not easily forget. They know now the limitations of trade unionism, and that there are forces in the State which cannot be adequately met with the so-called "economic action."

Hungary.

The Hungarian Socialist party held its annual congress at Buda Pesth April 12 to 14th, 1903. One hundred and eighty-two delegates representing 165 branches were present. Nearly one hundred telegrams and messages of greeting were received from parts of Europe. There were delegates from some half a dozen districts, each with a different language.

The delegates met in the new Market Square, Buda Pesth, on Sunday, where they had a gathering numbering about 20,000. In honor of the delegates this gathering formed itself into a torchlight procession,

with over 2,000 torches. Banners, 100 in number, were displayed bearing appropriate mottoes, these frequently bearing some uncomplimentary reference to the Jesuits and clerics. Among those present were delegates from the Austrian and Kroatic Socialist parties. The chairman, Dr. Goldner, in his opening address, said that he was pleased to see that the delegates present were not only drawn from the industrial class, but from the ranks of agricultural labor.

In the course of remarks made by various delegates by way of reports regarding local work, etc., one delegate stated that the gendarmes had taken his train money from him to prevent his attending the conference, but he had managed to come in spite of them.

The main business of the conference was the proper organization of the party in Hungary. A draft form of organization was submitted and discussed. The four main points were: (1) Conditions of membership; (2) main committee and the local management of the organization; (3) the number of members to be in the administrative council; (4) the branch contributions to party funds. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that admission to membership must not only include belief in the main ground principles of Socialism, but also subscription to the program of the party. With regard to contributions, it agreed that every member should contribute a minimum monthly subscription of one penny to the party funds.

The Hungarian movement while having existed for many years has been in a very confused state. *Die Zeit*, a liberal paper, in reviewing the proceedings of the congress gives a short history of the Hungarian Socialist movement, from which we take the following facts:

The first Socialist program in Hungary was put forth in 1869, but little progress was made until recent years, owing largely to internal troubles. Another great obstacle to progress was the extreme hostility of the government. Thousands of Socialists were driven out of their homes simply because they were Socialists. The collection of money for Socialist purposes was absolutely forbidden and all such money was subject to confiscation. The leaders of the Socialists were photographed and these photographs placed in the rogues' gallery of criminals until, as the above paper says, "Hungary is in every way a land of constitutional freedom, but this freedom was only for the ruling classes." At the present time this persecution has not by any means entirely ceased. "Minor officials oppress the Social Democrats as formerly, but when this is brought to the attention of the minister of the Interior, he ordinarily corrects matters. To be sure, this is often too late, especially when the persecution takes the form of forbidding meetings."

Some idea of the growth of the party may be seen from the fact that between May, 1901, and March, 1902, the party had an income of 42,742 kronen and an expenditure of 42,149 kronen.

Some of the more prominent members of the party are Dr. Adolf Goldner and Desidor Boknyl. "For many years the Social Democracy in Hungary was simply an opposition party, but this time is now gone by and it now follows its own individual purposes." How thoroughly true this is is shown by the extracts from the platform adopted at this congress, which we take from the *Deutsches Volks*

Zeitung, published at Temesvar, Hungary. "The freedom of the laboring class can only come as the result of the struggle which shall end all class domination and abolish its foundation by transforming private property into collective property, and thereby the capitalist system of production into the socialist system of production. The freeing of the working class is the historic mission of the laboring class itself. The class struggle can only be won through the conquest of political power. The methods of this class struggle are the instruction of all portions of the people, the propaganda of Socialist ideas and purposes, the political organization of the laboring class, and the furtherance of all means coinciding with the instinct of justice of the proletariat. Since class domination oppresses the proletariat of all lands, therefore its antagonism is an international task. The Hungarian Social Democracy therefore declares its party an international party and feels itself a part of the oppressed of all lands and a sharer of their battles. This battle is not for the purpose of creating a new class domination or privileges, but to abolish all privileges and to place all mankind without regard to distinction of nation, race, creed or sex upon an equality."

Australia.

The Victorian government recently demanded of the employes of the street railways that they sever their connection with the Melbourne Trade Hall on the ground that the Hall was a political as well as a trade union center and that the State Railway employes being in the position of civil servants must refrain from taking part in politics.

Since last August the railway employes have had to submit to two reductions in their wages, and it appears that these reductions were accepted on the understanding that they would be of a temporary nature, to assist in meeting the loss on the working of the railroads caused by the terrible drought from which Australia has been suffering.

The workers finally struck against these conditions and the organized laborers of all Australia came to their assistance. One of the results of this is liable to be a genuine Socialist movement throughout Australia and the clearing up of the distinction between Socialism and State Ownership.

The Social Democratic Federation of England is sending the following:

"The Executive Council of the S. D. F. sends fraternal greetings to the railway workers of Melbourne, and heartily wishes them success in their struggle to maintain their rights as citizens against capitalistic encroachments on their liberties, whether on the part of private employers or public functionaries. The Executive Council further calls attention to the fact that the mere ownership of monopolies by the present class State in the interests of the commercial classes must not be confounded with genuine Social Democracy, and by no means puts an end to the existing class antagonism; and that, in order to

achieve their emancipation, the working classes must organize themselves to acquire political power, so that they may be able to change the present class State into an organized administration for the benefit of the whole people."

Italy.

The Socialist daily, "Avanti," has always been under the control of the opportunist wing, but recently, as this division of the party has grown weaker, it has become incapable of supporting it and its circulation decreased. Finally the old editorial staff resigned and Enrico Ferri was elected as managing editor. It is understood that the revisionists are going to start another daily at Genoa which is to be open to all so far as they "represent the cause of labor, including Anarchists and Republicans."

Meanwhile the "Avanti" published an anti-military manifesto advising the troops not to act against their fellow workers and the government is prosecuting it. The Socialist deputy Cabini recently interpolated the government in regard to the condition of the workers in the rice fields. He brought out the fact that during the season which lasts from the end of May to the beginning of July not less than 40,000 women and children were working from 12 to 14 hours per day in water up to their waists, for which they were receiving about 30 cents per day. In this connection we notice from "L'Action" that there have been hunger riots in Palermo and throughout Sicily. These have been put down by troops, many of the persons being killed and wounded.

Belgium.

The congress of the Belgian Social Democracy was held in Brussels April 12th. Comrade Delnet in opening the congress declared: "Last year found us in the midst of the battle in which we met defeat, but the presence of 592 delegates at this congress shows that the movement is stronger than it has ever been before. The shed blood of the martyrs was good seed and has borne good fruit."

Victor Serwy reported from the co-operatives that they had made rapid progress and that during the past year ten new Maisons du Peuples had been erected.

Fournemont in reporting concerning the struggle for universal equal suffrage declared that the general strike of the year before was brought about without proper planning, and that it was, in many ways, premature but, nevertheless, his faith in the general strike as a weapon remained unshaken.

Vandervelde declared that the struggle for universal suffrage would be taken up again before the election of 1904. He attacked the position of the party organ, "Le Peuple," because it had been advocating a compromising attitude.

The treasurer's report showed an income of 11,844 francs and an expenditure of 11,150 francs during the last year.

BOOK REVIEWS

God's Children, A Modern Allegory, by James Allman. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, pp. 113. 50 cents.

While the plot of this book offers nothing really new, yet as a contribution to the literature of Socialism in the true sense of that word it has few equals. It is the story of the experiences of a divine messenger sent down to earth to investigate the condition of God's children. Not being satisfied with the gods furnished by existing theology and mythology the author creates one of his own so grand and gentle that the reader feels that it would not be hard to worship him.

This being sends his messenger to find how his children on the planet Earth are getting on. The Recording Angel informs the messenger before he starts that the best place to study them will be in London, where they have congregated in such numbers. So the messenger proceeds to this city, arrives at Charing Cross, travels over the West End and then starts along the Strand and Fleet Street to Whitechapel.

The story of the contrasts which he sees is told in the most strikingly effective manner. He arrives at a place where numerous public speakers are holding forth and listens to the Salvationist, Prohibitionist and finally to the Socialist, who delivers a speech which is in itself one of the best expositions of Socialist philosophy ever put in print. The Divine messenger is convinced of the justice of Socialism and asks of the speaker if there are any opponents of this doctrine, and is referred to a professor of Political Economy, Professor Ananias Average. He visits the professor's house, discovers the perfidy and dishonesty of the professor and denounces it, whereupon the professor orders him to leave.

"Mercury turned pale with contempt and wrath. Leave! yes, but you shall leave with me. I have seen suffering and vice among the ignorant, and here I see lying and deceit where the truth should be found. I met in Whitechapel the prostitutes of their bodies; here I meet a man of intelligence who prostitutes that which is more sacred, his reason.

"The professor sprang from his seat with a threatening gesture, but Mercury, powerful in his superhuman strength, towered above him, and, seizing him by the throat, threw him out of the window."

The messenger then returns to God and makes his report, and God declares that he wishes to see the things for himself. "God leaned his head upon his hand and turned his eyes in the direction of the earth. By a slight effort his almighty mind sweeping through intervening space, he contemplated the condition of his children.

"God looked and he saw dainty ladies with pink-white faces and sensual lips sipping rich wines and casting sensual looks upon the richly-dressed men who drank and sang and smiled with them. He saw stern, hard-faced plutocrats frowning from club windows upon the passing multitude; he saw luxury; he saw pride; he saw war; he saw lust, blood, ambition and arrogance.

"God looked and he saw the pallid wife of the workless laborer putting a cup of cold water to the lips of her starving child; he saw her squalid hovel and her want-pinched face; he saw her despairing husband struggling with thousands of others as sallow-faced as himself at the dockyard gates for the work which would provide bread for his wife and little ones, and God saw him turn away workless and desperate.

"God looked and he was angry.

"God listened and he heard soft sensuous songs of pleasure; he heard laughter, light but heartless; he heard sneers and contempt expressed for the poor and lowly, and hatred uttered in bitter words by the wealth-insolvent few for the suffering and toiling many.

"God listened. He heard the deafening roar and whirr of the mighty machinery in thousands of factories, but rising loudly and plainly above it the cries and groans of the little child-slaves who tended the machines. He heard the unuttered prayer of woe from the soul of the fallen woman compelled to sell herself in order to exist; he heard the desperate, blasphemous *De Profundis* hurled at heaven by the hopeless, starving wage-slave and he heard it in magnanimous forgiveness, for he is a merciful God. God listened and was angry. Threateningly he reached forth an arm, mighty as that of a giant, graceful as that of a Grecian athlete, toward the earth, and thus he spoke in his wrath:

" 'Oh, my children, misguided, sinful, wretched and sad. Oh, my children, avaricious, arrogant and selfish. Unto you I gave plenty and of it you have produced poverty; unto you I gave purity and peace and you have made impurity and war; unto you I gave reason and you have abused it so that you live in a worse way than the beasts to whom I gave it not. But I am God and I shall so will it in the near future that those among you who live in idleness and work not, shall not live upon the blood and sweat of the many who toil. For I will encourage with my omnipotent will the spread of that creed of hope for my children called "Socialism," and the desperate many shall arise against the despoiling few; they shall hurl the mighty from their high places; they shall despoil the despoilers and take unto themselves the just reward of their labor—the wealth of the earth.

" 'And then, when in the place of want and misery there shall be peace and plenty; when in the place of sighs of slaves and cries of starving children, there shall be laughter, song and joy and peace; when equality shall succeed despotism and justice supplant partial and venal law; when men shall work each for all, and all for each, then will you not blaspheme my name when you call yourselves God's Children.' "

As a propaganda work, a means of arousing the unthinking to action, it is doubtful if this book has an equal in the English language.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, pp. 133. 50 cents.

This is one of the fundamental basic sort of works that needs to be read over more than once and which will richly repay every successive reading with a harvest of new ideas. The translator has made a very valuable introduction connecting the work with current thought. It is the history of the connection between Hegelianism and the Marxian philosophy of history. Feuerbach occupied a position midway between the two, forming a sort of stopping place, as it were, between Hegel and Marx.

Almost every Socialist reader knows in a sort of an indefinite way that the materialistic interpretation of history is founded upon Hegelian dialectics, but if asked to explain these terms and their connection we fear that the majority would find themselves rather troubled. Hegel showed that history had a continuity and that each institution only lived so long as it fulfilled an historic function. Since he stated this, however, in the form of the maxim "All that is real is reasonable, and all that is reasonable is real," it gave rise to two schools according to the interpretation which they put upon the word "reasonable." If by "reasonable" they understood simply existing, then the Hegelian became an iron-bound conservative. If by "reasonable" he understood fitting to a present purpose he might easily become an extreme radical.

Feuerbach sprang from the "left" wing of the Hegelians. He sought also to substitute materialism for the Hegelian idealism. Nevertheless, he in no way understood materialism in its modern sense. Because of this confusion Feuerbach became decidedly reactionary. Engels, after discussing and criticising the work of Feuerbach, proceeds to set forth the materialistic interpretation of history in perhaps as thorough a manner as either of the great masters ever expounded it.

The book as a whole is one which no person who wishes to be thoroughly grounded in Socialist philosophy can afford to neglect.

Journal of Arthur Stirling. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cloth, pp. 356. \$1.25.

This book, which has attracted considerable attention in the public press and which is now known to be the work of Upton Sinclair, is supposed to be a description of the struggles of an author who had produced a masterpiece for which there was no great "public demand."

The author goes desperately from publisher to publisher in his efforts to dispose of it and finally commits suicide in despair. This book purports to be his diary. It is made up with rather hysterical denunciations of individuals and systems.

It is very evident that it is the tyranny of capitalism in the literary world against which he is rebelling, and his work in other lines has shown his close sympathy with Socialism, yet one cannot but wish that he had spoken a little clearer on this point. Nevertheless the work is one of sometimes startling strength and with a strange fascination which holds the reader throughout.

NEW AND STANDARD

Books on Socialism

Handsomely Bound in Cloth ... Fifty Cents Each

God's Children.—By JAMES ALLMAN. A Modern Allegory. One of the greatest satires on capitalist society ever written.

Britain for the British (America for the Americans.)—By ROBERT BLATCHFORD, author of "Merrie England." 200,000 already sold.

The Communist Manifesto.—By KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS. Ours is the handsomest edition ever printed of this classic of Socialism.

The Principles of Social Progress: A Study of Civilization.—By JAMES BALE MORMAN, A. B. Extra cloth, 240 large pages.

Letters from New America, or An Attempt at Practical Socialism. By CLARK EDMUND PERSINGER.

STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES

1. **Karl Marx. Biographical Memoirs.**—By WILHELM LIEBKNECHT. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. **Collectivism and Industrial Evolution.**—By EMILE VANDERVELDE. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. **The American Farmer.**—By A. M. SIMONS.
4. **The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.**—By ISAAC BROOME.
5. **The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. **The Social Revolution.**—By KARL KAUTSKY. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. **Socialism Utopian and Scientific.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
8. **Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Austin Lewis.

The *International Socialist Review*, edited by A. M. Simons, indispensable periodical for whoever wishes to understand socialism. 64 pages, 10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a year. We will send the *Review* a new name, and will mail any two of the books described a dollar, if this advertisement is mentioned.

Charles H. Kerr & Company. (Co-operative), 56 Fifth Ave

